





Brit.  
30g mm



<36604895320018

<36604895320018

Bayer. Staatsbibliothek







AN  
INTRODUCTION  
TO THE *1 x Rep.*  
HISTORY  
AND  
ANTIQUITIES  
OF  
SCOTLAND.

LONDON:  
PRINTED FOR T. NOTEMAN,  
NEAR NORFOLK-STREET, STRAND.  
MDCCLXIX.

79B



THE HISTORY OF

THE CITY OF

AMSTERDAM

FROM THE FIRST

FOUNDING

TO THE PRESENT

BY

M. D. C. C. X.



## A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

**T**H E following Essay was originally wrote in Latin by the late Mr. Walter Goodal, and prefixed to Fordun's Scotichronicon ; but that History being in few hands, and the Essay containing many particulars relating to the Antiquities of Scotland, either little known or entirely overlooked by other writers, the Editor was induced to give it to the Public in an English translation.



# ADVERTISEMENT

THE following Essay was originally  
written in Latin by the late Mr. Walter  
Goodal, and prefixed to Gordon's Scottish  
History; but that History being in many hands,  
and the Essay containing many particulars  
relating to the Antiquities of Scotland, either  
little known or entirely overlooked, by other  
writers, the Editor was induced to give it  
to the Public in an English translation.



# C O N T E N T S.

## C H A P T E R I.

*Of the length and breadth of Scotland, and the names by which it was known to the ancients,*

Page 1

## C H A P. II.

*It is proved that the Ierne of the Greeks, and the Hibernia of the ancient Romans, was the same with Scotland, or that part of Britain situate beyond the Forth,*

7

## C H A P. III.

*Julius Cæsar's description of Britain is considered, and reconciled with different passages of authors who have treated of Hibernia,*

21

## C H A P. IV.

*It is shewn, that different writers, after Ptolemy, considered Britain as divided into two islands,*

29

C H A P.



# C O N T E N T S.

## C H A P. V.

*The sophistical arguments of Usher and others, which they endeavour to found upon the Words of Gildas are refuted, and the genuine sense of that author is ascertained,* 45

## C H A P. VI.

*It is shewn, that the ambiguous and inconstant use of the words Hibernia and Britannia has given rise to various errors, of which the most remarkable are pointed out,* 54

## C H A P. VII.

*Of the origin and antiquity of the Scots,* 68

## C H A P. VIII.

*Of the walls and fortifications which the Romans erected against the Scots and Picts,* 77

## C H A P. IX.

*Of the origin of the Picts, the catalogue of their kings, and the bounds of their kingdom,* 98

## C H A P.



C O N T E N T S.

C H A P. X.

*Of the name of Scotland, and the mutual boundaries  
of the Scots and Picts, &c.* 117.

C H A P. XI.

*Of the boundaries of the Scots and Picts, from the  
arrival of the Saxons, to the time of the Normans,*  
136

C H A P. XII.

*A refutation of those who write that the English  
possessed Lothian and Edinburgh,* 148

C H A P. XIII.

*Of the town of Alcluith, and the kingdom of Srat-  
cludwal, otherwise called Stratclud, or Areclut,*  
164

C H A P. XIV.

*Of the testimonies of the English limits, and the in-  
troductiō of the Saxon language in Scotland,*  
177

C H A P.



C O N T E N T S.

C H A P. XV.

*Of the homage which was wont to be paid by the  
Scotch kings to those of the English,* 198

C H A P. XVI.

*Of the introduction of the Christian religion into  
Scotland,* 206

C H A P. XVII.

*Of the antiquity of the league between the Scots  
and French,* 221



INTRODUCTION  
TO THE  
HISTORY  
AND  
ANTIQUITIES  
OF  
SCOTLAND.

---

CHAPTER I.

*Of the length and breadth of Scotland, and the names by which it was known to the ancients.*

**T**HE kingdom of Scotland comprehends the north part of the island of Albion, or Great Britain, and the adjacent islands. It is separated from England, towards the west side of the island, by the Solway-frith, and, towards the east, by the Tweed.



The southern parts of it are situate in fifty five degrees of north latitude, excepting a small promontory, or two, in Galloway, neither of which extends farther than to fifty four degrees, fifty minutes. It is terminated, towards the north, in latitude fifty eight degrees, thirty five minutes, or, according to another calculation, in fifty eight degrees, forty minutes. Its greatest extent is from east to west, where the altitude of the pole is a little more than fifty seven degrees, measuring in Italian miles (of which sixty are equal to a degree of the æquator) CLXIII. in antient Roman, CCVIII. and in English CXC. but in the common maps, it is erroneously delineated, as of equal length and breadth.

It appears hence, that the southern boundary of Scotland is nearly coincident with the wall which the Roman emperor Severus drew across the island from sea to sea, as the barrier of his conquest; for the wall terminated at the Frith above-mentioned. Indeed, betwixt the eastern termination of the wall and the mouth of the Tweed, there is land to the extent of several miles, which probably, as happens in the frontiers of hostile nations, was sometimes occupied by



the Roman out-guards, and sometimes left deserted.

This kingdom, anciently, in different ages, received different denominations, and, like Italy itself and other countries, often assumed a new name. The most antient inhabitants, stiled by foreign nations, for the space of fifteen centuries, the Scots, call their country Alban, Albin, or Albinich, from Albion, the more antient name of the whole island, rejecting, in their own tongue, the appellation both of Scotland, and of Scots. But, by the Greek and Latin writers of antiquity, it is celebrated by the name of Ierne, (Hibernia) as, before the country was sufficiently known to them, they considered the greatest part of it, at least, that which is situate beyond the Friths of Forth and Clyde, as an island; imagining, no doubt, that both these formed one Frith, extending from the east to the west sea; although, as Tacitus says, when the truth was ascertained by his father-in-law Agricola, “ after  
 “ the tide of both seas has stretched an immense  
 “ way, they are separated by a narrow neck of  
 “ land, and so form only a peninsula, the  
 “ boundary of which is in Britain.”

As the Romans prosecuted their conquests northward, they found that the country which



they called Hibernia, was not an island, but a peninsula; and it appears likewise, that about the same time they first discovered the island, lying westward of Britain, and now named Ireland, which had formerly been unknown. From this time, writers began to give the name of Hibernia to the new discovered island, and the Hibernia of the ancients received the appellation of Caledonia, under which was comprehended the whole country, from the Frith of Forth to the northern extremity of Britain, as evidently appears from Tacitus de Vita Agricolæ, and Solini Polyhistor. cap. 22. Whence the inhabitants were called Caledonii, some say Caledones; but for this opinion there is no proper authority.

After a period of more than a hundred and fifty years, when the Romans had obtained a more accurate knowledge of the country, they perceived that it was inhabited by two distinct classes of People, the one, it seems, Britons, to whom, because they still retained the antient custom of that nation, of painting their bodies, a practice then become obsolete among the provincials, they gave the name of Picts; and the other, who differed from these in their manners, they called Scots; but for what reason,



authors have not agreed †. From that time the Romans gave no new appellation to the country; but the name of Caledonia remained to the end of their empire. This, however, did not obtain universally. There still were some who considered Britain as divided into two islands; the one of which they mentioned as a barbarous country, and the other, which was subject to the Roman power, by the name of the Roman island. In this they were zealously imitated by the Britons under their subjection, who, as appears from Gildas, boastfully called their own part of Britain (or rather that of their masters) the Roman island, or simply Romania, and the other Barbaria. Ptolemy, among others, in his astronomy, describes it as an island, named Little Britain, though, when he applied himself to writing geography, he changed his opinion, as will afterwards appear.

We find mention made of the Scots in the third century, and in the fourth very frequently; but the name of Scotland, as a country, scarcely exists in any approved historian before

† The conjectures of most authors, ancient and modern, with regard to the etymology of the various names of the ancient inhabitants of Scotland, are vague and unsatisfactory. In the course of the work we shall have occasion to explain their origin and derivation.



the end of the sixth. Thence forward, however, the country began, in part, to be called by that name, and among foreign nations, the whole kingdom has been denominated Scotland, for the space of a thousand years; though the inhabitants, not only in their own language, but likewise in their Latin writings, seem to have continued the name of Albany, even long after the conquest of the Picts. What has been said concerning the names given to Scotland in remote ages, might be sufficient, were there not a necessity of contending with some litigious English and Irish writers, in regard to the Hibernia of the ancients.



## CHAPTER II.

*It is proved that the Ierne of the Greeks, and the Hibernia of the antient Romans, was the same with Scotland, or that part of Britain situate beyond the Forth.*

**N**OT to mention the writers of our own country, Ranulphus Higdenus, an Englishman, long since remarked that anciently Scotland had the name of Hibernia, in confirmation of which he adduces many instances in his Polychronicum, lib. 1 cap. Scotia. But almost all the other English and Irish writers, wherever any mention either of Hibernia or Scotland occurs in authors, from the remotest ages down to the eleventh century, apply it all unjustly to the Irish. Of these, Usher, Archbishop of Armagh, leads the van, who, in his antiquitates Britanicarum Ecclesiarum, cap. 16. arrogantly says, “ he believes no authority can be “ produced, that ever Albany was called Scotland “ before the eleventh century.” I shall afterwards treat of Scotland, and, in the mean time, endeavour to prove, that Ireland, called now



for many years, though not always, by the name of Hibernia, was absolutely unknown to the ancients before the time of Vespasian; and that the country, named Hibernia in those ages, was situate north of the Roman island, or beyond the Frith of Forth.

In support of this assertion let us produce the testimony of the celebrated geographer Strabo, in whom may be found many passages relating to this subject; and first, in book IV. page 201. he has these words:

I. “ Hibernia, stretching northward, contiguous to Britain, is more extensive in breadth than in length.” He then mentions some allegations, such as, that the inhabitants lived on human flesh, and eat the dead bodies of their parents; but he relates these reports, not from any spirit of defamation, as some other writers, but as being strange, and corresponding to the extravagant accounts, generally delivered of the customs of remote nations. Wherefore, he subjoins by way of apology, that “ the truth of these reports is not vouched by any credible testimony: that the Scythians, it is said, eat human flesh, and, during extreme necessity, in sieges, the French, Spaniards,



“ and many other nations have done the  
“ same.”

II. In book II. page 72. “ In this age, the  
“ farthest navigation from France northward,  
“ is said to be to Hibernia, which, situate  
“ beyond Britain, is not easily inhabited, on  
“ account of cold; so that the climates still  
“ more northerly, are reckoned absolutely un-  
“ inhabitable. But Hibernia is computed to  
“ be only five thousand stadia distant from  
“ France.”

III. In book II. page 114. “ But I am of  
“ opinion, says he, that the boundary of the  
“ habitable part of the globe is much nearer  
“ the south than Pytheas, for instance, ima-  
“ gines, who supposes it to be about Thule,  
“ where the summer tropic supplies the place  
“ of the arctic circle; for at this day sailors can  
“ inform us of no country beyond Hibernia,  
“ which is situate northward, adjacent to  
“ Britain (*ἢ πρὸς ἄρκτον πρόκειται τῆς Βρετανικῆς*  
“ *πλησίον*) the habitation of savages, who scarcely  
“ can live for cold. Here therefore would I  
“ place the boundary of the habitable part of  
“ the world.”

IV. Ibid. page 118. “ The greatest breadth of  
“ the habitable part of the world is comprehend-



“ ed within two parallel lines, the one drawn  
 “ across the Nile, along the Cinnamon country,  
 “ and the island of Egyptian exiles, and the  
 “ other along the northernmost verge of Hibernia.”

V. Ibid. “ I have observed, that the breadth  
 “ of it is distinguished by two parallel lines,  
 “ separating the habitable from the uninhabitable  
 “ part: that towards the north, running along  
 “ the farther skirts of Hibernia, and the line  
 “ next to the torrid zone passing through the  
 “ Cinnamon country.”

VI. Ibid. page 132. “ The habitable part of  
 “ the world is comprehended within two boun-  
 “ daries, the southern parallel, which termi-  
 “ nates the Cinnamon country, and the nor-  
 “ thern, which terminates Hibernia.”

From these passages it appears incontestible, that Strabo considered Hibernia as the ultimate boundary of the habitable world; an island, according to his description, situate above, or beyond Britain, on the north, and not on the west, which is the space that is occupied by Ireland. And there is no question, that in this he intirely coincided with the sentiments of other ancient geographers, whom he praises in the course of his works. For, had any eminent author maintained a different opinion, it is not



to be supposed that he would have positively declared Hibernia to be the extremity of the habitable earth, without taking notice of the authorities from which he had dissented in that point. Casaubon remarks on book I. page 63. that Strabo imagined Hibernia to be *πρὸς ἄρκτους*, north of Britain, in which, says he, he was egregiously mistaken, as it is situate rather on the west. But he has not clearly understood Strabo's meaning, as will hereafter appear.

It may be insisted, that this great geographer is erroneous in his opinion of the situation of Hibernia; that under the description of a great island, adjacent to Britain, but distinct from it, he certainly means no other than Ireland; and that the country beyond the Forth is not an island, but a part of Britain itself; that, if it should be granted, that by the name of Hibernia, Ireland is not understood, it would follow, that this most celebrated geographer has intirely overlooked that country, which is improbable to suppose.

That the country beyond the Forth is in reality not an island, but a peninsula, I readily acknowledge. However, Strabo and other antient authors were of a different opinion; whose meaning ought to be evinced from the



intrinsic testimony of their own writings, and not wrested to coincide with our sentiments, whether true or false. This, however, is the common practice of modern authors, and those especially who write the history of Britain, who, no less ignorantly than unjustly, endeavour to reduce the sentiments and opinions of our ancestors to a conformity with the capricious standard of the principles and manners of our own times.

That the ancients considered Britain as divided into two islands, viz. Britannia and Hibernia, the former of which extended to the Frith of Forth, and the latter commenced from it, is manifest, not only from what has been said, but particularly from the length which they assigned to Britain, from south to north. For Strabo says, “that the Bactrii, who bordered  
 “on Caucasus, near Daimachus, were three  
 “thousand three hundred stadia farther north  
 “than Hibernia: to which, says he, if we add  
 “the distance between Massilia and Hibernia,  
 “it will make twelve thousand five hundred  
 “stadia.” Whence, according to Strabo, Hibernia is distant from Massilia eight thousand seven hundred stadia. But he had often said,



at a gross calculation, that the distance from Britain to Massilia was five thousand stadia.

Therefore, since the Hibernia of the ancients was situate on the north of Britannia, as we have shewn above, it follows, by the computation of Strabo, that the extent of Britannia, from south to north, was three thousand seven hundred stadia, or four hundred and sixty-two Roman miles and an half; which exactly corresponds to the length of that part of Britain, situate south of the Forth. For Edmund Halley observed, that its most southern promontory was forty-nine degrees fifty-five minutes from the equator; and we know that the Frith of Forth, above Edinburgh, is fifty-six degrees from the equator, or that the pole, at that Frith, is fifty-six degrees of altitude. But Norvodus ascertained, by observation, that a degree of the meridian in Britain, contains 367,196 English feet, or 69.54469 English miles. And the same Halley found, that fifty-two English miles were nearly equal to fifty-seven Roman. Whence, the length of Britannia, to the Forth, is four hundred and sixty three Roman miles and an half. It is evident, therefore, that Britannia extended no farther than this boundary;



and hence, likewise, that the Hibernia of the ancients commenced.

They knew not that Ireland was an island, but imagined it to be a part of Britain, as is equally apparent from the length which they ascribed to Britain, from east to west. “For the island of Britain, as Strabo writes, lib. II. page 128. is stretched in a parallel direction, and equal extent with Gaul, about the length of five thousand stadia.” And in book IV. page 199, he computes its extent more precisely, to four thousand and three or four hundred. The mean number between these, is 4350 stadia, which makes nearly DXLIV. Roman miles, and comprehend the breadth both of Britain and Ireland. It may thus be proved. The breadth of these islands runs from east to west, where the altitude of the pole is fifty-two degrees thirty minutes, through eleven degrees and about forty-eight minutes of a parallel circle, as appears from the best geographical tables we are possessed of, those of M. de L’Isle. Let us therefore suppose, for want of more precise calculations, that a degree of the equinoctial circle contains 365,658 English feet, which we know from observation to be the measure of a degree of the meridian over all France; and



eleven degrees forty-eight minutes of the parallel, drawn through fifty-two degrees thirty minutes, by the ratio of the sphere, measure DXLV Roman miles. From this we may observe the wonderful exactness of Strabo.

Other passages of the same purpose might be produced from Strabo, did it not appear unnecessary to insist any further upon a doctrine which is already ascertained beyond dispute. In one passage only the great author, from whom I have extracted these authorities, seems to speak in a different strain, where he says, in book I. page 63. “ Now from Massilia to the  
 “ middle of Britain the distance is only five  
 “ thousand stadia; and the extent of four stadia  
 “ farther brings us to a country where it is  
 “ difficult to live, namely, about Hibernia; as  
 “ the more remote parts, in which he has placed  
 “ Thule, are uninhabitable.” But instead of μέσσην τὴν Βρετανικὴν, which is interpreted, the middle of Britain, we ought to read, εἰς τὴν Βρετανικὴν, because, both in the same page and other places, he ascribes as many stadia to Celtica itself. Besides, should we admit the common interpretation, our author would assign to Britain far too great a breadth, and even double, or more,



than he has expressly mentioned in other passages, namely, eight thousand stadia.

It is probable that the sailors, who, when they turned the Land's End, as it is called, a promontory of Britain, and had a prospect of Ireland, imagined, without making proper inquiry, that it was a continuation of the same island. However this may be, it is certain, from the evidence I have produced, that the ancients looked on the south part of Britain and Ireland as the same island, and the northern part as a different one, which they called Hibernia.

Nor was Strabo the only author who had fallen into this error; for Pomponius Mela relates the same. "Above Britain, says he, is Juverna, almost equal in extent, but of an oblong figure." It is common with geographers to say that a country is situate above, when it lies northward. It is certain likewise, that he includes Ireland under the name of Britain, especially as he remarks that it much resembled Sicily; because, otherwise, that similitude would be wholly inapplicable. The commentators on Strabo are not a little puzzled, that both he and Mela affirm, that Hibernia is more broad than long: "which is true, says



“ Xylander, “ if the breadth be computed from  
 “ fouth to north.” Cafaubon propofes another  
 conjecture : but they are all mistaken in regard to  
 the Hibernia of Strabo and Mela. Thefe geogra-  
 phers fpeak of that part of Britain lying beyond  
 the Forth, and their fcholiafts imagine they al-  
 lude to Ireland.

Claudius Ptolemæus entertained the fame opi-  
 nion when he wrote his Great Syntaxis, though,  
 when he was engaged in his geography, he al-  
 tered his fentiments, after Antoninus had built  
 his wall. He certainly fpeaks of a pretty large  
 ifland, diftant a degree, or LXX Englifh miles,  
 north from Catterick, under the name of Little  
 Britain; by which he can mean no other coun-  
 try than Scotland beyond the Forth : although,  
 contrary to all reafon, the Irifh endeavour to  
 fix that appellation to their own ifland†. For  
 Ptolemæus, in lib. 11. c. 6. of his Syntaxis, after  
 enumerating five parallels running through  
 Great Britain, has thefe words :

“ The twenty-fourth parallel is that under  
 “ which the longeft day is 17 hours 45 minutes.

† Usher, cap. xvi. p. 378.



“ It is 57 degrees from the equator, and passes  
 “ through Catterick.

“ The twenty-fifth parallel is where the dura-  
 “ tion of the longest day is for 18 hours. It is  
 “ 58 degrees distant from the equator, and  
 “ passes along the north borders of Little Britain.

“ The twenty-sixth parallel is where the  
 “ longest day is 18 hours three minutes. It is  
 “ 59. 30. from the equator, and runs through  
 “ the middle of Little Britain.

“ Where the longest day is 19 hours, the  
 “ parallel is 61 degrees from the equator, and  
 “ passes along the northern parts of Little Bri-  
 “ tain.”

He therefore makes Little Britain extend only three degrees from south to north, which is perfectly applicable to the country beyond the Forth, but not in the least to Ireland; both because the latter extends for more degrees, and that the author fixes the southern parts of Little Britain a degree of the meridian above Catterick: which parallel will pass through the middle of the new Hibernia, described afterwards by the same Ptolemy in his geogra-



phy; and, indeed, ought to pass an intire degree above its extremity.

The opinion, that Hibernia was an island situate on the north of Britannia, seems to have so much influenced the imaginations of men, that even after the error was discovered they could not divest themselves of the prepossession. Of this we meet with an instance in Ptolemy, who, whilst he is describing New Hibernia in his geography, that he might not dissent from other writers, by placing it farther south than the northern parts of Britannia, describes them as extending from west to east, inverting their true situation; when, in reality, they are extended from south to north. And it is highly probable, that his only reason for so doing was, that he might place Hibernia northward, as the ancients had described it. On this error was founded the conjecture of Maclaurin, that the Romans invaded Scotland on the west, and thence proceeded eastward. But this could not have been performed without transports: and it is not probable that the Romans invaded Scotland by sea, or that they could fall into the error of mistaking the west for the south. It is more



reasonable to suspect, that they who entertain such conjectures, are unacquainted both with history and geography. For should we suppose that the Romans landed at the extremity of the Solway frith, which is the most westerly entrance, their march to the west sea, on their left, would be as long as to the east, on their right.

Of this we meet with no instance in Ptolemy, who, while he is describing the situation of the province, that he might not dissent from other writers, by placing it further south than the northern parts of Britannia, describes them as extending from west to east, insinuating their true situation; when, in reality, they are extended from south to north. And it is highly probable, that his only reason for so doing was, that he might place Britain northward, as the ancients had described it. On this error was founded the conjecture of Mr. Machin, that the Romans invaded Scotland on the west, and thence proceeded eastward. But this could not have been performed without transports: and it is not probable that the Romans invaded Scotland by sea, or that they could fall into the error of mistaking the west for the south. It is more



## CHAPTER III.

*Julius Cæsar's description of Britain is considered, and reconciled with different passages of authors who have treated of Hibernia †.*

WE have hitherto prosecuted our investigation among the most celebrated ancient geographers. It now remains that we

† “ The Greek and Latin names of Ireland are to be  
 “ derived from its western situation, from the wintry tempe-  
 “ rament of its air and climate.---It may be likewise observed,  
 “ that the first syllable of the Latin word Hibernia is always  
 “ long in the Latin prosody, and the first syllable of Iberia  
 “ short. From this circumstance it may, with some shew of  
 “ probability, be inferred, that the poets were strangers to  
 “ the relation between the Spaniards and the Irish. To sup-  
 “ pose that the Greek name of Ireland, that is Ierne or  
 “ Iouerna, comes from the Greek word which signifies *Holy*,  
 “ is surely no more than a groundless fancy, though em-  
 “ braced by a learned gentleman. Had it come from that  
 “ epithet, it must have been written with an aspiration, like  
 “ Hiera, one of the *Agates*, and Hira, one of the *Æolian*  
 “ islands. One of the rivers in Spain is called Ierna by  
 “ Mela. Ireland, like that river, was called Ierna, from  
 “ the



examine the description of Britain, as drawn by Julius Cæsar, which is imagined to invalidate the doctrine which we have endeavoured to establish. “The island,” says he, “is triangular; one side of which lies opposite to Gaul: of this side, one angle, which is in Kent, whither the ships from Gaul are generally steered, points towards the east, and the other to the south: the extent of this side is about five hundred thousand paces. The other looks towards Spain and the west, on which is situated Hibernia, less by half, as is imagined, than Britain, but equally distant thence as Britain is from Gaul. In the middle of the intervening space, is an island, called Mona. The length of this side, according to the common opinion, is DCC thousand paces. The third lies towards the north, beyond which there is no land; but the angle of that side is principally directed to Germany. The extent of this side is computed to be DCCC the Celtic word *Iar*, that is West; and the name of *Erin*, by which it has been always known by the Irish and Highlanders of Scotland, is manifestly a compound of *Jair*, *West* and *In*, *Island*.”



“ thousand paces.” Hence it appears, say authors, that the Hibernia of Cæsar is our Ireland, situate westward of Britain. And this, they think, is strongly confirmed, by the island Mona being expressly said to lie in the middle between Britain and that country.

But it ought to be considered, that the situation of Britain, as described by Cæsar, is quite inverted, since he mentions the length of it as extending from east to west. For, by placing the angle in Kent, it would follow, that the part of Britain lying beyond the Forth ought to stretch westward. And while Cæsar fixes the extent of the shortest side at D thousand paces, we ought to examine whether he includes not Ireland in that computation, as we are certain others have done. That this is really the case, there is much reason to imagine, since he ascribes greater length to the side beginning from Kent, and stretching northward, than to that which is directed towards Spain. Nor does the mention of the island Mona intirely decide the point; as in the frith of Forth there is an island, called Æmona, or Y Mona, that is the island Mona. For, among the ancient Scots, Y or I signified an island, in the same way as Ai



among the Hebrews. Cæsar, who undoubtedly was conversant in the ancient geography, seems to have drawn thence his authority, that the island was longer from east to west, than from south to north: the reasons for which opinion have been adduced in the preceding chapter. But being informed by the natives of Britain, that there was no large island to the north, but only to the west, while he endeavoured to correct others, he himself has fallen into errors by mixing different accounts; so that of all which he relates, we scarcely can determine any thing with certainty, and geographers appear to have paid but little regard to his information. The testimony of those who have professedly written of geography is, without any question, much more credible and authentic. Should we admit, that Britain extended DCCC thousand paces westward from the corner in Kent, and that Ireland lay beyond it, this immense tract would stretch into America; for the limits of Europe could not contain it.

What light is thrown on several passages in authors, by the discovery that the ancients regarded the part of Britain situate beyond the



Forth as an island, will appear from some examples.

JUVENAL. Sat. ii. 159.

——— Arma quidem ultra

Littora Juvernæ promovimus, et modo captas

Orcadas, et minima contentos nocte Britannos.

CLAUDIAN panegy. in iv. Consulat. Honorii.

v. 38.

Scotorum cumulos flevit glacialis Hiberne.

In i. Consulat, Stilichonis, v. 24.

Inde Caledonio velata Britannia monstro, &c.

Me quoque vicinis pereuntem gentibus, inquit,

Munivit Stilicho totam cum Scotis Hibernen

Movit, &c.

Here the appellation of Juverna or Hiberne can by no means be applied to Ireland, as the Romans had never invaded it. Neither can these passages refer to the Orkneys, which are distant from Ireland near CCC thousand paces, lying adjacent to the north coast of Scotland. But Usher affirms, that Claudian here alludes to an Hibernian, i. e. an Irish fleet, forsooth, which was driven upon the coast of Britain about that



time†; and both from these passages, and Eumenius the Rhetorician's Panegyric upon Constantius, he strenuously contends, that Ireland was the country of the ancient Scots: his sentiments concerning which subject many of the English admire and adopt. But whatever indulgence may be shewn to these writers, as men who copied without judgment, we cannot acquit Usher on the principle of integrity; for he was sufficiently acquainted with all the facts which I have produced from Strabo, Mela, Ptolemy, and others: and he designedly avoids praising Strabo, who has left us so many circumstances relating to Hibernia; chusing rather to extract his materials from the fabulous lives of saints or geographers, who have written darkly on the subject, and whose meaning, therefore, he hoped, might be more easily wrested to his purpose. May he not be said to have practised, in his own conduct, the advice which he gave to Charles I. in regard to private and public conscience, that in compliance with the latter, he might perpetrate whatever he pleased, in spite of all the remonstrance of the former? As to Eumenius, he

† Cap. 15.



makes use of these words concerning Cæsar's expedition into Britain †. “ Ad hoc natio etiam tunc  
 “ rudis, et soli Britanni Pictis modo et Hibernis  
 “ affueta hostibus, adhuc seminudis, facile Romanis armis signisque cesserunt :” from which passage they infer, that the island, at that time, was inhabited only by Britons. Buchanan insists, that this passage ought to be otherwise interpreted : “ Before the arrival of Cæsar, the  
 “ Britons fought against the Picts and Scots  
 “ (there named Hibernians) enemies of Britain,  
 “ i. e. living in Britain.” This opinion is not a little corroborated, by observing, that the part of Britain which most of the Picts and Scots inhabited, was called by the ancients Hibernia. Guthrie, in his History of England, pronounces the interpretation of Buchanan to be ridiculous. But neither the sense, nor arrangement of the words, can admit of any other : and such a form of speech occurs in very celebrated writers.

Camden and Usher, together with their followers, endeavour in vain to draw Dionysius Periegetes, and his ancient interpreters, to their

E 2

† Panegyric, ad Constantium, c. xvi.



side, as if they had made mention of Ireland. He says, that there are two islands opposite the mouth of the Rhine: but he gives not the smallest intimation of differing from Strabo, who wrote in the same age. Who, therefore, can doubt that Strabo dissented from him? The same might be said of Aristotle, Apuleius, and others, who mention nothing of the relative situation of these islands to one another. Nor, probably, ought the passage in the Argonautics to be interpreted in any other sense,

Πὰρ δ' ἄρα νῆσον ἀμείβεν Ἰερνίδα,

although Usher insists upon it, as an evidence in favour of his Ireland; of the antiquity or name of which not even the Romans can afford the smallest testimony †. Concerning the later writers, it is sufficient to observe, that those who read Ptolemy, have, in conformity to him, placed Hibernia on the west of Britain; and they who perused Strabo, above, or northward of it.

† Cap. xvi. p. 378,



## C H A P. IV.

*It is shewn, that different writers, after Ptolemy, considered Britain as divided into two islands.*

**I**T has been observed above, that some writers, even after the Romans had discovered that Britain extended beyond the Frith of Forth, still considered it as terminating there. Of this I shall produce a few instances.

Prosper Aquitanus, in his work against Cas-  
sian, concerning pope Cœlestinus, says: “ Nor  
“ was he less diligent in ridding Britain of the  
“ same infectious principles, when he banished  
“ from their country some enemies of the faith,  
“ and appointing a bishop to Scotland, while  
“ he endeavoured to preserve in the Roman  
“ island, the exercise of the Catholic religion, he  
“ also converted a barbarous country to Christia-  
“ nity.” What bishop was appointed to the  
Scots by Cœlestinus, the same Prosper informs  
us in his Chronicle, under the consulship of Bas-  
sus and Antiochus. “ Palladius,” says he, “ is  
“ ordained by pope Cœlestinus, and sent, as the



“ first bishop, to the Christians in Scotland.”  
 And in less than two years afterwards, when  
 Florentius and Dionysius were consuls, “ Agri-  
 “ cola Pelagianus, son of the bishop Severia-  
 “ nus Pelagianus, corrupted the churches in Bri-  
 “ tain with his doctrine : but, at the instance of  
 “ Palladius the deacon, pope Cœlestinus sent  
 “ Germanus Antissidorensis as bishop in his  
 “ room, who, after expelling the heretics, in-  
 “ structed the Britons in the true faith.” By  
 the advice of Palladius, therefore, Cœlestinus  
 provided for the churches of Britain by the  
 bishops above-mentioned, and for those of Scot-  
 land by Palladius himself. And these churches  
 were not beyond Britain, but beyond the Roman  
 province in Britain. For, that Palladius was  
 sent among the Scots is acknowledged by all  
 antiquity, and even by later authors, excepting  
 Usher, and a few English, who contend for the  
 contrary, on the authority of one or two fabu-  
 lous lives of saints, lately invented, which, for  
 me, they may enjoy in peace. How much more  
 just is the remark of Hadrianus Valesius on this  
 passage of Prosper, lib. iii. rer. Francic. p. 144.  
 “ Thus, therefore, the English possessed five



“ provinces of Britain, which were subject to  
 “ the Romans ; the others being inhabited by the  
 “ Picts and Scots. And forasmuch as, according  
 “ to Prosper, the part of Britain, which was con-  
 “ quered by the Romans, was formerly called  
 “ the Roman, and that inhabited by the Picts  
 “ and Scots, the barbarous island, all Britain,  
 “ at length, received the latter denomination.”

Usher, however, makes no scruple to apply these parts of Prosper to Ireland \*. “ I have  
 “ formerly observed,” says he, “ that Britain  
 “ was called Romania ; and that Hibernia, and  
 “ the other nations, not subject to the Roman  
 “ jurisdiction, had the name of Barbaria.”  
 Our reverend prelate here affirms a proposition  
 which no body ever denied, namely, that the  
 country not subject to the Roman power, was  
 called Barbaria ; but he mentions not a syllable  
 of his Hibernia. That a nation, which was sub-  
 ject to the government of the kings of Scotland,  
 and in the beginning of the seventeenth century  
 continued barbarous, would, had any opportu-  
 nity occurred, been called barbarous by writers,



is a matter not to be questioned. But there is no reason to infer thence, that this passage in Prosper is to be understood of Usher's Hibernia, or Ireland.

Gildas, the most antient British writer, calls the part of Britain which was subject to the Romans, the *Island*, *Roman Island*, and *Romania*.

Cap. 5. et cap. 10. "The island had the  
" name of Roman, but adopted neither the Ro-  
" man customs nor laws; nay rather rejected  
" them."

Cap. 12. "The Roman legion ordered the  
" citizens to erect a wall beyond the island,  
" from sea to sea, that, being guarded by a mul-  
" titude of troops, it might be a terror to the  
" the enemy, and a protection to themselves."

Cap. 14. The Romans advised, "That the  
" inhabitants of the island should defend, with  
" all their strength, their land, their effects,  
" wives, and children, and, what is more,  
" their liberty and lives, by inuring themselves  
" to arms, and fighting manfully in the field;  
" and that they should stretch forth their hands



“ to the nations, who never could resist them,  
 “ unless they resigned themselves to sloth  
 “ and inactivity; not unarmed, to be bound  
 “ in chains, but furnished with bucklers, swords,  
 “ and spears, and prepared for slaughter.”

Chap. 23. “ The Saxons declare, that, on an  
 “ infringement of the treaty, they will depopu-  
 “ late the whole island: and their threats are ac-  
 “ complished without delay.”

Chap. 24. “ The fire, when once kindled,  
 “ raged furiously; nor did it cease till it reached  
 “ the western ocean.”

Chap. 26. “ For the mention of so despe-  
 “ rate a destruction of the island, and unexpect-  
 “ ed assistance, remained in the memory of those  
 “ who were witnesses of both the wonderful  
 “ facts.”

Chap. 15. “ The hideous herds of Scots and  
 “ Picts, disagreeing in some of their manners,  
 “ but unanimous in the rage of slaughter,—  
 “ leap forth in troops from the boats in which  
 “ they passed the Tethica,—— and knowing the  
 “ resentment which they provoked, and the  
 “ impossibility of retreating, with more than  
 “ wonted boldness, they take possession of all the



“ northern and remotest parts, as far as the wall,  
 “ like natives of the country.” And in chap-  
 ter xix. “ The Picts then first and hencefor-  
 “ ward remained quiet in the extremity of the  
 “ land, only sometimes giving loose to plunder  
 “ and hostilities.” Of all these passages, if we  
 adhere to the sense of the author, not in one in-  
 stance is the whole country of Britain to be  
 understood as comprehended under the name of  
 The Island, but only that part of it which was  
 subject to the Romans.

The same Gildas, in his short history, some-  
 times calls the whole island, as in the beginning,  
 by the name of Britain, and sometimes only the  
 Roman part of it, as in cap. xi. “ Henceforth  
 “ Britain, with all its armed bands and military  
 “ forces, is left a prey to its united conquerors:  
 “ deprived of an immense number of its youth,  
 “ who never returned home from the fatal ex-  
 “ pedition of the tyrant Maximus; and totally  
 “ ignorant of the art of war, it groaned many  
 “ years under the grievous oppression of two  
 “ foreign nations, excessively cruel, the Scots  
 “ from the \*\*\*\* and the Picts from the north.”



On this subject Bede is no less explicit, in his chronicle, under Theodosius: “ The most outrageous foreign nations, the Scots from the  
 “ \*\*\*\* and the Picts from the north, invade  
 “ the island, destitute of defence, and, after  
 “ waisting and plundering it, oppress it for  
 “ many years.” And what here he calls simply The Island, in the ecclesiastical history \*, he names Britannia in the country of the Britons:  
 “ Henceforth Britannia, in the country of the  
 “ Britons, deprived of all its forces, &c. groaned  
 “ for many years under two foreign nations,  
 “ excessively cruel, the Scots from the \*\*\*\*  
 “ and the Picts from the north.” And lest he should be misunderstood, he adds, “ I have  
 “ called them foreign nations, not that they  
 “ were situate beyond Britain, but because they  
 “ were remote from the part possessed by the  
 “ Britons: two gulphs intervening, the one of  
 “ which from the east sea, and the other from  
 “ the west, extend a great way into Britain,  
 “ though they do not unite.” As Gildas calls the part of the island, which was subject to the

\* Lib. i. cap. 12.



Romans, simply The Island, and the Roman Island, or, as some copies have it, Romania; so he called the unconquered part of it, the country of the Scots and Picts, Barbaria, and Transmarine, as if it were a distinct island: thus in cap. 14. “ On the shore of the ocean, toward  
 “ the south, where their (the Roman) ships lay,  
 “ and the attack of the wild beasts of Barbaria  
 “ was dreaded, they erect towers at certain distances, in sight of the sea.” From what has been said, it must appear evident to every considerate person, that it is the same island Barbaria which is intended both by Prosper Aquitanus, and Gildas.

Gildas, indeed, makes no mention of Hibernia; but he calls the Scots Hibernians. For after relating the last devastation of the Britons, by the Scots and Picts, he concludes thus in cap. xix. “ The impudent Hibernian banditti,  
 “ therefore, return home, not long to remain.  
 “ Henceforward the Picts continued quiet in the  
 “ extremity of the island.”

Claudian, as I have shewn in the preceding chapter, called the country of the Scots in Bri-



tain Hiberne; retaining its ancient name long after it was found not to be an island, and even after the name of Hibernia was conferred on the island of Ireland by some authors, as Cornelius Tacitus, and Ptolemey. It is not surprising, therefore, that Gildas, who imitated the Romans, should call the inhabitants Hibernians. It is evident, that the two ancient authors above-mentioned meant no other country nor people than those of the Picts and Scots, or Hibernians; as the one, in cap. xxiii. calls them the northern nations, with whom the Britons were at war, and the other the remotest Britons, against whom the Romans had erected a wall \*.

Venit et extremis legio prætenta Britannis,  
 Quæ Scoto dat fræna truci, ferroque notatas,  
 Perlegit exanimes, Picto moriente, figuras.

John of Fordun has remarked many passages in Bede, William of Malmfbury, Galfrid, &c. where they comprehend, under the name of Britain, only the Roman part of the island, which we now call England, and allege it to be separated

\* De bello Getico, v. 416.



from Scotland †. And that custom prevailed among some till the sixteenth century. For Abraham Peritfol, in his *Itinera Mundi*, written in Hebrew, often mentions Scotland as an island, as in cap. 7. “ In that same northern ocean are  
 “ many fine islands, such as England, and Scot-  
 “ land adjacent to it; as also Ireland, which is  
 “ situate below it, in the middle of that sea.” Again, in cap. xii. “ The island of Scotland is  
 “ almost contiguous to England, only that they  
 “ are separated by a small branch of the sea:  
 “ and the island of Hibernia is near them, to-  
 “ wards the north.” Thomas Hyde, who translated him, is so much surprized at these passages, that in the second chapter he has this note:  
 “ He seems,” says he, “ to have imagined, that  
 “ the river Tweed, which divides Scotland from  
 “ England, at Berwick, made them intirely dis-  
 “ tinct islands. Thus, in the table of the seventh  
 “ chapter, we read the *Island Scotland*, which I  
 “ have taken no notice of in the version, as in  
 “ the body of the work he calls it only Scotland.  
 “ But in the ii. vii. and xii. chapters, Scotland

† Lib. ii. cap. 2, 3.



“ is plainly mentioned as a distinct island, con-  
 “ trary to the common way of speaking. Thus  
 “ the Nubian geographer, in climate vii. part  
 “ second, *the island of Scotland borders upon Eng-*  
 “ *land.* So that though our Hebrew writer has  
 “ committed a mistake, he was not singular  
 “ in his opinion, but was misled by those  
 “ who had wrote before him.” Thus far Tho-  
 mas Hyde, who certainly had very justly ac-  
 quitted Abraham of any singularity of opinion,  
 had he consulted the authors above-mentioned.

It deserves to be remarked of the Nubian  
 geographer, that he describes Ireland under its  
 own name. Usher cites the passage cap. xvi.  
 and is obliged to confess that Albany † is there

† “ It is unnecessary to produce authorities to shew that the  
 “ island, which now goes under the name of Britain, was in  
 “ early ages called *Albion*. To search for a Hebrew or Phæ-  
 “ nician etymon of *Albion* has been the folly of some learned  
 “ writers. In vain have some attempted to derive it from the  
 “ white cliffs near Dover, or from a Greek word which fig-  
 “ nifies a certain species of grain, or from a gigantic son of  
 “ Neptune.

“ In the Celtic language, of which so many different dia-  
 “ lects were diffused over all the European nations of the west



designed by the name of Ireland. But he artfully conceals that island's being mentioned,

“ and north, and, let me add, the Scythians of Asia, the vocal *Alp*, or *Alba*, signifies *high*. Of the Alpes Grajæ, Alpes Pæninæ, or Penninæ, and the Alpes Bastarnicæ, every man of letters has read.

“ In the ancient language of Scotland, *Alp* signifies, invariably, an eminence. The Albani near the Caspian sea, the Albani of Macedon, the Albani of Italy, and the *Albanich* of Britain, had all the same right to a name founded on the same characteristical reason, the height or roughness of their respective countries. The same thing may be said of the Gaulish Albici near Massilia.

“ The Celtic was undoubtedly the language of the Belgic Gaul. For this we have the authority of Strabo. That from the Belgic division of Gaul the first colony must have transmigrated into South Britain, must be readily allowed. The vicinity of the two countries, and the shortness of the passage, is an argument in this case equal to a demonstration. It was natural enough for men, who had been once settled in the low plains of Belgium, to give the name of *Alba*, or *Albin*, to Britain, on [comparing the face or appearance of it to that of their former country. Men who had come from the Netherlands would most probably have called this new world *Albin* in an oblique case, and *Alba* in the nominative. And it is to be observed, that almost all the local names of the Celtic tongue are energetical, and



because, forsooth, in the same chapter, he has scraped together some passages of writers, in which Ireland, or the island of Ireland, and Scotland, or the island of Scotland, are barely mentioned, and has boldly ascribed them all to Ireland before the eleventh century. He foresees that his flimsy evidence would be intirely invalidated, if it was acknowledged, that Scotland was mentioned, either by the name of Hibernia, or an island, by the Nubian geographer, Strabo, Mela, Ptolemy, Claudian, Prosper, Gildas, Bede, William of Malmfbury, Galfrid, and others.

“ descriptive of the peculiar properties or appearances of  
“ places.

“ The Greeks became in some degree acquainted with Bri-  
“ tain, and its original name, long before the Romans had  
“ any opportunity of knowing either. Agreeably to the ge-  
“ nius of their language, the former naturally gave a new  
“ termination to *Albin*; and their Albion must have, in pro-  
“ cess of time, passed to the Romans. But the true Celtic  
“ name of the island having travelled gradually into the re-  
“ moter parts of it, was there retained, by a race of plain un-  
“ civilized men, who having no intercourse with the Greeks,  
“ and very little with the Romans, adhered invariably to  
“ their mother tongue, and particularly to the local names  
“ which had been transmitted to them by their ancestors.”



This, therefore, he was desirous to conceal. With the same ingenuity, when he endeavours to ascertain from Gildas † the application of the word *Barbaria*, in order to take hold of the barbarous island of *Prosper*, he has left out the passage above extracted, which was the most apposite to the purpose, and has chosen another less suitable, where Gildas calls the country of the Saxons the den of a barbarous lions. Because had he appealed to the former, it would have proved, that *Prosper* meant the very same country which Gildas calls by the name of *Barbaria*. It is not surprising, therefore, if a person, who prevaricates so openly, should insist, that when “ *Prosper* expressly distinguishes the “ country of the Scots from Britain, he ought “ to be understood as speaking of the greater “ Scotland, or *Hibernia*, and not of the other, “ or Albany (which, at that time, was not Scotland, nor even now is an island, but only a “ part of the island of Britain). Certainly, says “ *Richardus Vitus Basinto*chius, when *Prosper* “ speaks of the Britains in the plural number,

† Cap. xvi. p. 416.



“ he includes the Roman island Britannia, and  
 “ Hibernia, or that which was called barbarous,  
 “ where, it is believed, the Romans never pene-  
 “ trated.”

Very true, indeed; Albany, or Scotland, is not an island, but only a part of the island of Britain: of this we need not be informed. The point in controversy is only whether Prosper and other writers represent it as an island or not? And that they actually considered it as an island, has been sufficiently proved. Nor will I venture to affirm that our country had got the appellation of Scotland in the time of Prosper (which Usher, however, asserts of his Ireland) when that name scarcely occurs for many years after: though if it did occur, I should imagine it could be applied to no other country than ours, which, it is certain, was inhabited by the Scots. And the very name of the inhabitants of Ireland is not to be found before those times. Nor do I see why he should say that Scotland, at present, is not an island; or for what reason it can be more or less an island now than then. He seems likewise to have introduced Vitus Bafinstochius



very absurdly, in order to prove, that, when Prosper speaks of the Britains in the plural number, he meant both Britannia and Hibernia; when, in the sentence immediately preceding, Usher himself makes use of the same number, and yet excludes Hibernia. Whoever consults the antients will find mention made of the Britains, Spains, &c. where nothing more is understood than Britain, Spain, &c.

Nunc Galliaë timent, timent Britanniaë.

Mavult quam Syrias, Britanniasque. CATUL.

Dic alias iterum naviget Illyrias. PROPERT.

In the same manner we find Europe mentioned in the plural number among the Greeks :

καὶ νησιώτας, καὶ μακρὰς Ἑυροπίας.



## C H A P. V.

*The sophistical arguments of Usher and others, which they endeavour to found upon the Words of Gildas are refuted, and the genuine sense of that author is ascertained.*

**W**HAT has been advanced in the preceding chapter is so clearly deduced from the words of the writers there mentioned, that it seems impossible to interpret them in any other sense, without making the whole of them absolutely contradict each other and themselves. It is amazing, however, that on these very authorities, and especially two places in Gildas, the enemies of the Scots have attempted to intrench themselves, and throw out the most frivolous arguments, the futility of which must be apparent to every reasonable person, from what has already been said; but unless each of them is particularly refuted, perhaps it may be insisted upon by smatterers, that nothing has yet been said to overturn them.

Gildas writes, that the Scots invaded Britain *a. Circio*, which Usher affirms to be from the



West, and consequently from Ireland, which lies on that side\*; in this he is joined by Ludus Afaphensis E. † Stillingfleet, more cautious than the rest, places the point *Circius* in the middle between the West and South, where others place the point *Africus* ‡, that he might separate the Scots farther from Scotland, and fix their habitation in Ireland. The English Translator of Gildas interprets *Circius* the South, as also do the English Dictionary writers, for which they appeal to Pliny, as if he had said in lib. ii. 47. that it was the South wind which blows from France over Italy. But Pliny wrote no such falsehood; he certainly never dreamed that Italy lay South of France. They next accuse Bede of ignorance, because he had explained in what sense the Scots and Picts might be called foreign or transmarine nations, “ crying out, that even in the time of Bede, the Scots and Picts had their residence beyond the Friths of Edinburgh and Clyde, and, as far as he knew, might have had it for a long time before; that Bede very rightly apprehends the words of Gildas concerning the Picts;

\* Cap. xv. p. 310. † De regim. eccles. Brit. p. 19.

‡ In præf. ad orig. Britan.



“ but, in regard to the Scots, that Gildas ex-  
 “ plains himself much better, when he says that  
 “ they came from the west (they will have us  
 “ take the west for the point of Circius) and  
 “ afterwards, concerning their return, *the Hi-*  
 “ *bernians*, says he, *return home*. Where was  
 “ their home except in Hibernia? §” And from  
 some written glossary, annexed to Gildas,  
 Usher || endeavours to confirm this still farther;  
 it is pleasant to hear him triumphing in these  
 words \* “ This single Passage of Gildas, the  
 “ most antient British writer, from whom Bede  
 “ extracted his information, may be sufficient.  
 “ *The Hibernians return home, not long to remain*  
 “ *The Picts then first and henceforth reposed them-*  
 “ *selves in the extremity of the island*. In which  
 “ it is to be observed, i. that the Picts then  
 “ first and henceforth did not simply reside,  
 “ but rested in the north part of the island, i. e.  
 “ as I interpret it, that they ceased from the  
 “ terrible devastation of Britain, which Gildas  
 “ had before described. For, although he sub-  
 “ joins that they sometimes plundered, yet he

§ Afaphensis E. ubi supra.

|| Cap. xv. p. 310.

\* Cap. xv. p. 319.



“ plainly confesses, in the words immediately  
 “ following, that a truce was made with the  
 “ desolated people, and the ravage left off (or  
 “ as Bede explains it, the hostile devastation  
 “ ceased.) 2. That the Scots were natives of  
 “ Hibernia, is remarked, as just, by Polydore  
 “ Virgil, on this Passage. Whence we see, that  
 “ those, whom Gildas calls Hibernians, are  
 “ named the Scots by Bede, when, in his chro-  
 “ nicle he is repeating the same history from  
 “ Gildas. 3. That after the third consulship of  
 “ Ætius, and in the year 646, the Scots re-  
 “ turned to their Hibernia, whence, removing,  
 “ not long after, they again fixed their resi-  
 “ dence in the north part of Britain, which  
 “ is supposed to have been done by Fer-  
 “ gus, whose sovereignty over the Hibernians  
 “ is clearly ascertained, by the accounts of  
 “ Gildas and Bede, to have been posterior to  
 “ the third consulship of Ætius, though the  
 “ Scots imagine it to be more antient.” What  
 a world of nonsense about three syllables! all  
 which, however, the rapid wind Circius scatters  
 with one breath through the immense void, and  
 shews to be intirely contrary to the words of



Gildas, or absolutely repugnant to his sense. The wind Circius blows not from the south, as the English Dictionaries have it, nor from the west, as Usher and Lud here assert; neither comes it from between those two points, as Stillingfleet imagines, but according to the ancients, who reckoned twelve winds, it is the next to the north on the west, as the Aquilo is towards the East, and is the same with the Thrafcias. “*Ἀπαρτία*, or Septentrio is the north point; next to which on the right is “*Τρασμία*, or Circius, and on the left *Βορέας*, i. e. “Aquilo” says Vegetius. Timostenes, in Agathemeris †, places Thrafcias between Aparctia and Argeste, “which, says he, the near inhabitants likewise call Circius. ‡” On the north, says Seneca, the highest point is Aquilo, the middle is Septentrio, and the lower is Thrafcias. In the same signification Circius occurs twelve times in P. Orosius, cap. 11. Vitruvius, who in his large and minute catalogue of the winds, has advanced many notions, removes the various winds from their places, among which

† De re milit. iv. 38.

‡ Georg. i. 11.



are Circius and Aquilo; fixing the latter nearer the east, and the other the west, contrary to the custom of the antients. But not a single author is to be found, who favours the opinions of our adversaries. That Circius blows not from the west, may be learned from Lucan de portu Herculis, lib. i. v. 406.

—— Non corus in illum,  
Jus habet, aut Zephyrus, solus sua littora turbat  
Circius, et tuta prohibet statione monæci.

On which passage Jo. Sulpitius remarks, that Circius is a northerly wind, blowing nearly from the point Corus. Whoever is desirous of knowing more of these matters, may consult Salmatii Exercitationes Plinianæ in Solini Polyhistoria, p. 878. Strabo calls this wind *πνεῦμα μελαμβόριον*; in which signification it is also received by the writers of the middle age; among whom Charles du Fresne remarks, in a glossary, that Circius is next to the north, where, in support of his opinion, he adduces many instances, which it is unnecessary to transcribe, when it is evident, from the very first words of the history of Gildas, that his Circius is the same; for he



begins thus, “ *the island of Britain, situate al-  
 “ most in the extremity of the world, towards Cir-  
 “ cius and the west, where Circius cannot be se-  
 “ parated from the north.*” Bede subscribes to  
 the same opinion, in the beginning of his eccle-  
 siastical history; “ Britain, an island in the  
 “ ocean, is placed betwixt the north and the  
 “ west.” And before these, Pliny writes, that  
 it lay between the north and west. The  
 Spaniards too, at this day, use the word çierço  
 instead of Aparctia. Gildas himself calls the  
 Scots and Picts northern nations, cap. xxiii.  
 nor does he acknowledge any as Scots or Hi-  
 bernians, except those who come from the  
 north. This furnishes an easy answer to the  
 question of Lud, which he thinks so smart;  
 namely, that the residence of the Hibernians  
 was in Hibernia; but in that Hibernia, which is  
 situate northward, adjacent to the Roman pro-  
 vince in Britain, of which the Scots are the true  
 inhabitants: and that this is no other than Scot-  
 land appears incontestible, not only from what  
 has been said in chap. ii. and iii. but from the  
 express words of Gildas. It is doubtful, there-  
 fore, whether our adversaries ought to be ac-



cused most of ignorance or malice, when they scruple not to support their extravagant notions with the authority of Gildas, to whose evidence they are intirely repugnant. In an old manuscript of Gildas, and the edition of Gale, the passage above quoted reads otherwise, namely, *they return to their Hibernian home*. Usher made use of that manuscript, but he concealed this passage, as being contrary to his purpose. I take notice of this the rather to shew the candor of the man, than that I think such a reading should be embraced. The other interpretation is supported by all other manuscripts and editions, as well as the authority of Bede; and what is still a stronger argument for adopting it, unless we read *Hiberni, the Hibernians*, the sense of the passage will be imperfect, for thus Gildas, “ the impudent Hibernian banditti  
 “ therefore return home, not long to remain.  
 “ Henceforward, the Picts continued quiet in  
 “ the extremity of the island, &c.”

As to the other allegations they advance, I pass them over, as being intirely repugnant to the authors from whom they are pretended to be derived, and even totally absurd. It is suf-



ficient to have refuted their principal arguments, the rest, having not the smallest foundation, will fall to the ground of themselves.

AFTER the Romans had discovered that Britain was one continued island, extending from its southern coast, opposite to Gaul, as far as the angle of Scotland, beyond which lies Thule, as Solinus says; and that there was another pretty large island situate westward of it, now called Ireland, which I have above observed was known in the time of Julius Cæsar; they began to give this new discovered country the name of Iuverna, which had formerly been appropriated to the north part of Britain, described by the ancients as an island distant from the continent, when as yet they knew not Ireland, as I said, to be an island, as has been already proved in the second chapter. And even the etymology of the word is conformable to this opinion, if we allow, with



## C H A P. VI.

*It is shewn, that the ambiguous and inconstant use of the words Hibernia and Britannia has given rise to various errors, of which the most remarkable are pointed out.*

**A**FTER the Romans had discovered that Britain was one continued island, extending from its southern coast, opposite to Gaul, as far as the angle of Caledonia, beyond which lies Thule, as Solinus says §; and that there was another pretty large island situate westward of it, now called Ireland, which I have above observed was known in the time of Vespasian; they began to give this new discovered country the name of Hibernia, which had formerly been appropriated to the north part of Britain, described by the antients as an island distinct from the southern, when as yet they knew not Ireland, at least, to be an island, as has been clearly proved in the second chapter. And even the etymology of the word is correspondent to this opinion, if we allow, with



Bochart, that it signifies the farthest dwelling; which might have been said of Scotland with great appearance of truth, but could not with any propriety be applied to Ireland. But this is a matter of little importance when compared with those which have been derived from it. For while many later writers, following the opinion of the ancients, continued to represent Britain as divided into two islands, to the northernmost of which they gave the name of Hibernia, and to its inhabitants that of Hibernians, or Scots, indiscriminately, they led the more modern writers, especially foreigners, into an inextricable labyrinth, after Hibernia had been adopted for some ages as the proper name of Ireland. They perceived the Scots were called Hibernians, and were said to have their residence in Hibernia, or Jerne; but they found that their wars, and all other achievements had passed no where but in Britain. How this could happen, those who knew not that Hibernia was the antient name of Scotland, and only translated to Ireland, could not account for in any other way, than by imagining that the Scots from Ireland, which they reckoned Hibernia,



had fettled as a colony in Britain. They embraced, therefore, this opinion, by which only the difficulty could be solved. Bede, as far as I know, was the first who adopted this opinion, in his ecclesiastical history of England, which he brought down to the year 731, whence it was propagated among others: for it was the common practice in those times to transcribe precisely the words of former writers. Henceforward, it became the custom, especially among the English, to write Hibernia for Scotland, and Scotland for Hibernia, i. e. Ireland, indiscriminately: infomuch that they even interpreted *Hiberna* Scotland; of which some Instances are produced in Fordun, lib. ii. cap. 16. The Irish, who are more addicted to fables, than any other nation, beholding this, and not contented, unless all the atchievements of the Scots in Britain, whether against the Romans, Britons, or otherwise, should be ascribed to themselves (though not the smallest mention of them was made at that time, or at least, has not been handed down to us) in order the better to establish their allegation, they began to detract from the antiquity of the Scots, and to contend, that they



had no settlement in Britain before the fifth, or even the sixth century; to which opinion they have now procured the assent of the English, a recent nation in Britain. But these legends, as late inventions, unknown in the earlier ages, I shall now particularly refute; because, from what has already been advanced, and will be said afterward, they will be found not only intirely void of foundation, but repugnant to the evidence of antiquity. However, it is much later, nor before the fourteenth century, and even then with difficulty, that the Scots seem to have admitted, that they drew their origin from Ireland. For they make no mention of that country in an epistle concerning their origin, which they sent to Pope John in the year 1320 ||. But in a controversy which Baldred Bisset maintained in the Roman court, against the allegations of the king of England, when the arguments were to be supported by authorities drawn from chronicles and history, it is granted, as it were only by the way, that originally they had been inhabitants of Ireland. In the same age John of Fordun, who wrote the history of Scotland, overpowered

|| Ap. Jo. de Fordun, lib. xii. c. 2.



with authorities and testimonies which he knew not fully to refute, likewise adopted that opinion; nor that alone, but also many other fictions of the Irish, concerning their origin from Egypt, which had actually begun to be exploded from the time of Nennius, who wrote in the ninth century: all which I forbear entering into the discussion of, as being not only repugnant to authentic monuments of facts, but generally inconsistent with reason. The historian above-mentioned was not the deviser of these fables, but related them as they had been invented by others; wherefore I hold him more excusable than either the original author, or those who still maintain such fictions, and affirm that the Scots came from Ireland. And this notorious error, arising from the ambiguous use of the word Hibernia, disgraces our history. I have already clearly proved that the country which was inhabited by the Scots was the Hibernia of the ancients. Those, therefore, who contend that they derived their origin thence, must allow them to have been aborigenes.

The various significations of Britannia has introduced an error no less remarkable, though of



a different kind: for reading in Bede, Paulus Diaconus, Matthæus Florilegus, and others, that “ the Romans overthrew a great multitude  
 “ of the Barbarians, and drove the rest to the  
 “ extremity of Britain; and that henceforward  
 “ the Picts repofed;” Fordun, not attending to what he himfelf had faid on the fubject, in lib. ii. cap. 2, 3. imagined that the Scots were banifhed, and that the Picts obtained from the Romans a quiet fettlement in Scotland: though it is evident from the very account, that by *Britain* is meant only that part of it which is fouth of Severus’s wall, and by *the extreme part* of the ifland, is underftood the part next to that wall; though Ufher labours much to darken this paffage alfo, as appears from his words quoted in the preceding chapter. Nor was Fordun the firft who fell into this error: the Englifh had gone before him, and had bafely mifinterpreted their antient authors. It is certain that Matthæus Weftmonafterienfis, “ after he had related that the Scots and Picts  
 “ were banifhed the territories of Britain, in  
 “ the year 620, writes, that about the year 634



“ they returned along with the Dacæ and Nor-  
 “ wegians, and took possession of the whole  
 “ island, almost destitute of inhabitants, from  
 “ the north as far as the wall which the Romans  
 “ had built for the defence of the country :”  
 and such accounts are to be met with in other  
 writers. Therefore, though Fordun, in these  
 places, has not shewn himself a good critic, he  
 must be acquitted both of fraud and falsehood.  
 Had he thought himself at liberty to dissemble  
 this expulsion, as related by others, and to have  
 deduced the origin of the Scots whence he  
 pleased, he certainly would not have mentioned  
 the other, nor have chosen to derive his ances-  
 tors from a people so much stigmatized, rather  
 than from the Saxons themselves, whom he  
 seems not much to have affected.

This exile, according to him, commenced in  
 the year 363, and continued to 403. Others  
 derive the beginning of it from the year 378.  
 Buchanan says that it lasted twenty-seven years,  
 and ended in 403. But that computation makes  
 a chasm of many years, which cannot be admit-  
 ted in chronology. For, when he writes that  
 they were expelled their country about the year



360, according to the number of years which he assigns to their kings, he follows the chronology of Funccius in ascertaining their return, where they are said to be banished Britain in 378; and the beginning of the reign of Fergus II. is fixed in the year 404. He observed not that this calculation is deficient in seventeen years. It is surprising he did not find from the Roman writers, that Maximus had not, at that time, made himself master of Britain, and that the Scots then possessed that country as formerly; since it is evident, from these circumstances, that this expulsion was entirely a mistake. Ammianus Marcellinus relates, that he had mentioned the expedition of Constance Augustus, who marched to the assistance of the Britons against the Scots and Picts: “And  
 “seeing,” says he, “that when I wrote the  
 “history of Constance, I explained, as well as I  
 “could, the ebbing and flowing of the ocean,  
 “I thought it superfluous to return to what had  
 “been discussed before.”

But this he had related in his account of Constance's expedition into Britain, which he men-



tions in the beginning of his twentieth book to have been written by him. Now that expedition was undertaken the year after the victory over the Franks, as appears from the oration of Libanius, inscribed Βασιλικὸς, i. e. in the year 343, which Ja. Gothofredus found out from the subscription leg. 5. Cod. Theod. de extraordin. In the same place, he mentions another expedition of Constance against that people, in the year 360: “ But ten times, during the consulship of Constantius, and thrice in that of Julian, when the barbarous nations of the Scots and Picts in Britain, breaking the peace, laid waste, in their incursions, the country contiguous to their borders; and the provinces, wearied with a series of disasters, were filled with terror, &c.” Lud of Afaph, while he endeavours all in his power to make it believed, that the Scots always invaded Britain from Ireland, perverts the sense of this passage, which is so directly repugnant to his fictions; as if Ammianus had said, that the Scots and Picts invaded the places which they had agreed upon among themselves: when it is plain, that he



writes of the stipulated truce which had been broken ; and the very phrase which he uses, of the excursions of the nations, shews evidently that he means the invasion of a people within the island. Perhaps he copied this error from Fabrus : but there is no reason that we should follow the authority of either. Camden, likewise, in his *Britannia*, cap. *Scoti*, misinterprets Ammianus in regard to the territory disputed by these nations, as will clearly appear to any who considers his words. The same Ammianus relates, in the year 368, that the Picts, Saxons, Scots, and Attacotti, harassed the Britons with continual molestations. Again, in book 27, concerning the transactions of the year 368, he has these words: “ Valentinian, therefore, as  
 “ he was marching from Amiens to Treves, received the disagreeable intelligence, that the  
 “ Britons were reduced to great straits by a barbarous conspiracy ; that Nectaridus, lord of  
 “ the western coast, was killed, and Fullofandes taken by ambush.—And since,” says he,  
 “ when I wrote the history of Constance—I  
 “ delineated the situation of Britain to the best



“ of my power, I thought it unnecessary to re-  
 “ turn again to points which were settled. It is  
 “ sufficient to say, at that time, the Picts, who  
 “ were divided into two nations, viz. the Deu-  
 “ calidoniæ, and Vecturiones, together with the  
 “ Scots, and the Attacotti, a warlike nation,  
 “ wandering up and down, committed great  
 “ depredations.” Theodosius afterwards came  
 up with them, as they were ravaging London,  
 where he put them to flight, and retook the  
 towns and garrisons, &c. In which words, he  
 so plainly asserts, that the Scots, Picts, and At-  
 tacotti lived then and formerly in Britain, that  
 it is impossible to doubt of it. Camden \*, how-  
 ever, and after him Innes †, endeavour to prove  
 the contrary from this very passage of Ammianus:  
 for, say they, it is evident, from the expression  
 of the *Scots wandering up and down*, that they  
 had not as yet fixed their residence in Britain.  
 Any person who reads Ammianus attentively  
 will find, that the Picts and Attacotti are said to  
 wander up and down, as well as the Scots. But  
 let it be said only of the Scots. Mean while,

\* Britan. cap. Scoti, p. 90.

† In Tentamine Critico, tom. ii. p. 516.



what sort of reasoning is it, that the Scots, wandering up and down, committed many devastations in a hostile country; were they, therefore, destitute of a fixed residence? We must necessarily own, that this is equally absurd with their other arguments.

In the year 383, Maximus, a Spaniard, being appointed a commander in Britain, valiantly overthrew the Scots and Picts, according to the chronicle of Prosper, Pithæanus, and Sigebert; with whom Gregory of Towers seems to agree †.

Claudian testifies, that about the year 400, Stilicho afforded succour to the Britons against the Scots and Picts ‡:

*Inde Caledoniò velata Britannia monstro,*

*Ferro picta genas : cujus vestigia verrit*

*Cærus, oceanique æstus mentitur amictus ;*

*Me quoque vicinis pereuntem gentibus, inquit,*

*Me juvat Stilicho, totam cum Scotis Hibernen*

*Movit, et infesto spumavit remige Tethys.*

† Hist. Franc. i. 38.

‡ In 1. Consulatus Stilichonis, v. 247.



Illius effectum curis ne bella timerem  
 Scotica, ne Pictum tremere, ne litore tuto  
 Prospicerem dubiis venturum Saxona ventis.

In the year 303 or 304, the legion which lay opposite to the Scots and Picts, at the wall, was recalled by Stilicho, as the same Claudian informs us:

Venit et extremis legio prætenta Britannis,  
 Quæ Scoto dat fræna truci, ferroque notatas  
 Perlegit exanimes, Picto moriente, figuras.

Where it is plain that the Scots and Picts are called the remote Britons. The same author, in other places, often mentions the Scots, not as exiles, but a perpetual enemy. Thus, in the epithalamium of Palladius and Celerina:

—Quæ Sarmaticis custodia ripis,  
 Quæ sævis objecta Getis, quæ Saxona frenat,  
 Vel Scotum, legio.—

Between the year 414 and 419, or, according to others, 418 and 423, the Romans twice sent to defend the Britons from the Scots and Picts,



who had invaded them : at which time, according to Gildas and Bede, they first erected the turf wall against them, and afterwards one of stone.

In 541, the Britons being, as Bede relates, repelled from that wall, wrote to Ætius, the consul ; of which letter he recites a few words : To Ætius, the third time consul, the groans of the British. *The barbarians drive us to the sea ; the sea drives us back to the barbarians : between the two we suffer prodigiously ; we are either killed in the field, or drowned.* And when they could procure no assistance from him, they hired the aid of the Saxons, which proved their destruction. It is evident, therefore, that for a hundred years and upwards, in which period this fictitious banishment is said to have happened, the Scots, not as exiles, or a conquered people, nor at variance with the Picts, but, on the contrary, firmly united with them, continually harassed the Britons who were subject to the Roman power. And when all these facts were known to Buchanan, how he should assert that they then were banished the country, I cannot conceive !



## C H A P. VIII.

*Of the origin and antiquity of the Scots.*

**H**ITHERTO I have treated almost intirely of the country inhabited by the Scots: I shall now inquire concerning their origin, whence, and when they arrived in Britain.

Those who investigate the rise and progress of ancient nations, think they have sufficiently ascertained the truth, if they only relate what is probable: but if, proceeding farther, they can support their opinions with plausible arguments, it is acknowledged by all candid judges, that they have amply discharged their duty. Those who derive the origin of the Britons from the Trojans, of the Scots from Egypt, and of the Picts from Scythia, certainly relate very improbable fictions. For it will appear reasonable to any one, who considers the situation of the island of Britain, that it must have been first occupied by colonies from the adjacent country of Gaul. That the Britons are actually derived thence, after various accounts of their origin have in



vain been delivered, is now regarded by our neighbours as certain : as is likewise the opinion, that the Picts were not of a different extraction, but were unconquered Britons, who, because they retained the ancient custom of painting their bodies, now disused by those who were subject to the Roman yoke, began to be distinguished by the Romans under a suitable appellation. And notwithstanding what Bede and others have related to the contrary, these facts are generally now embraced by the learned. Had they deduced the Scots also from Gallic extraction, they would have maintained a more probable opinion. Indeed, that they were not intirely of the same nation with the Britons and Picts would appear hence, that, as Gildas says, their manners were different. Had not this been the case, the Romans would have comprehended them under the name of the Picts. But it is objected, that their common language shews them not to be of different origin ; or, at least, that the greatest part of the primitive words is founded the same by both nations. But you will say, that the French, Italians, and Spaniards are also not originally different people, neither the Romans dis-



tinēt from the Greeks. Cæsar, Strabo, and Ammi-  
 anus Marcellinus, who knew best, say, that the  
 people of Aquitain in Gaul, the Celtæ, and the  
 Belgæ, differed from each other in their lan-  
 guage, customs, and laws. I should imagine,  
 that the Britons were descended from the Belgæ,  
 and the Scots from the Celtæ. Concerning the  
 former, Cæsar speaks thus :

“ The maritime part was occupied by those who  
 “ had passed over from Belgium for the sake of  
 “ war and plunder: most of the towns were named  
 “ after those which had formerly been the residence  
 “ of their invaders: the buildings resembled  
 “ those of Gaul.” Hence also sprung the custom  
 of painting their bodies; for, in Propertius II.  
 xv. 25 and 30. the Belgic colour is the same  
 with the British: and what Virgil † calls the  
 Belgic chariot, is named the British by Proper-  
 tius, II. i. 36. The Scots call their language  
 the Gallic, and with great justice, as Edward  
 Lhuyd has observed. Liscus held the chief ma-  
 gistracy, which the people of Autun, says Cæ-  
 sar ‡, call Vergobretus, who is created annually,  
 and has the power of life and death. In the

† Georg. i.

‡ De Bello Gallico, lib. i.



language of the Scots, that word literally signifies a person who judges. Vercingetorix, the name of the general of the Arverni, signifies, among the Scots, a man who is the leader of an expedition. Vergasillannus, the name of another commander of the Arverni, denotes a standard-bearer in the language of the Scots. Edward Lhuyd produces more examples, which those who are curious may consult.

What time the Scots first arrived in Britain, is uncertain; however, it is probable they were the first inhabitants, because they adopted the ancient name of the island for their own, calling their country Albin, and themselves Albniach, from Albion; which scarcely would have happened, had they succeeded any other inhabitants in the island, after that name had been abolished. And by this name were they known also to foreign nations, as we learn from Hieronymus, who calls Pelagius an Albin Dog†; and he affirms of the adjacent Britons, that they were the offspring of the Scots, as in another place he says, they were loaded with the pulse, or

† Vid. Augustini, opt. tom. 10. app. 2. col. 78.



water-gruel of the Scots. Prosper, Bede, and others, call Pelagius a Briton, perhaps from the general name of the whole island. But the most credible testimony is that of Hieronymus, with whom Pelagius was acquainted. Antonius Pagi remarks, that when Hieronymus calls Pelagius an Albin Dog, he alludes to the Scotch dogs, which were famous over the world, of which Symmachus in epist. ii. 77. Pelagius, therefore, was of the Scots in the island of Albio, or Albion; for no body as yet had dreamt that there were Scots in any other country. And this single testimony is sufficient to overthrow all the arguments of the English and Irish against the antiquity of the Scots in Britain. It would appear, then, that the Scots came from some part of Gaul, perhaps the Celtic; and while as yet they were following their scattered herds and flocks, some strangers came over from Belgium, who, taking possession of the nearest places, drove them gradually towards the north: and that, afterwards, the Romans shut them up in the west part of the country, which they now possess, while some of them made for Ireland and the western isles. For, that Ireland did not



give colonies to Britain, but received them from it, seems clear from the very situation of the islands. Besides, Edward Lhuyd attests, that there are some remains of the language of Scots in the names of mountains and rivers, and that some of it is still preserved even in common discourse in England and Wales; of the use, or signification of which, the Britons can give no information: and of this he produces many examples. Whence he concludes, that, when these names were imposed, the Hibernians possessed those countries. And that such a tradition is prevalent among the ancient Britons in Wales, both in the south and north parts, the same author informs in his late additions to Camden's Britannia †. “ I have observed,” says he, “ the inhabitants of those mountains call  
 “ any champaign country *Hendrew*, which signifies an ancient habitation; and it is current  
 “ among them, as well as the inhabitants of the  
 “ mountainous parts of Brecknock and Radnor,  
 “ that the Hibernians anciently possessed these  
 “ countries: which I thought worthy of re-

† In Caernarvon-shire.



“ marking, as it can hardly be imagined, that  
 “ the inhabitants of the southern part of Wales  
 “ could be informed of this by the people of  
 “ Brecknock and Radnor, or these, on the other  
 “ hand, by the former; since they are separated  
 “ from all mutual commerce by a country ex-  
 “ tending almost eighty thousand paces.” If  
 we attentively consider all these circumstances,  
 we shall find, that they afford more certain evi-  
 dence of the descent and antiquity of the Scots,  
 than the Romans were able to produce for the  
 origin of their own Quirites.

Usher †, however, insists, “ it was well re-  
 “ marked by the learned Camden, that, if every  
 “ history and record had been lost, and no au-  
 “ thor had transmitted to us that the true Scots  
 “ were descended of the Hibernians (the Irish),  
 “ the very identity of their language would  
 “ easily confirm it, and even sooner than the  
 “ authority of the gravest historians.” He  
 afterwards produces some passages to the same  
 purpose, from John Major. But, with defe-  
 rence to Usher, this observation very little re-  
 commends his own doctrine, or that of Cam-

† Cap. xv.



den, or Major. For, what sort of argument is this; the Scots and Irish use one sort of language, therefore the Scots are descended from the Irish? Why should we not rather say, that the Irish are descended from the Scots, when the situation of the two countries authorizes that opinion? and when the name of Hibernia denotes Scotland among the more ancient writers, and was not given to Ireland till much later, and that too with impropriety, to which either not the smallest regard was paid in former times, or it was considered, I believe, ominously, as a part of Britain beyond the Forth. Nothing more can be concluded from the resemblance of their language, than that both the nations were descended from the same stock, however that happened. The argument of John Major seems to be managed the best, as he adduces the testimony of Bede and others. But the testimony of Bede is supported by no authority; and what he relates of the origin of the Scots and Picts favours of old women's tales. Almost all the English, after Camden, allow, that the account which he has given of the origin of the Picts is erroneous; nor



seems there to be any more truth in what he has related of the Scots. That these were the most antient inhabitants of Britain, seems probable from the reasons above-mentioned.



## C H A P. VIII.

*Of the walls and fortifications which the Romans erected against the Scots and Picts.*

**T**HE Romans, with great labour, erected walls and fortifications, to prevent the incursions of the Caledonians, or the Scots and Picts, and protect the part of the island which they had conquered. About the year 81 †, Julius Agricola established a guard in the narrow tract of country lying between the Clyde and the Forth. He was the first of the Romans who penetrated so far; but these boundaries were soon lost. The emperor Hadrian ‡ “ came over  
“ into Britain, and drew a wall, extending  
“ eighty thousand paces, to separate the Romans  
“ from the Barbarians;” not where Agricola had placed his guards, for that space is much narrower, but he erected his turf wall from the Solway Frith to the mouth of the Tyne, where some vestiges of it remain unto this day. After-

† Tacit. in Vita Agricolæ,

‡ Spartianus.



wards Antoninus Pius “conquered the Britons  
 “by Lollius Urbicus his lieutenant, who con-  
 “fined the Barbarians within narrower limits,  
 “by means of another turf wall.” That this  
 extended between the friths of Forth and Clyde  
 is evinced from several Roman inscriptions found  
 in that place; many of which bear the name of  
 Antoninus, and one that of Lollius. Antonius  
 Pagi reckons, from the coin of Antoninus, that  
 this transaction happened in the year 140; and  
 this conjecture is not a little confirmed by an in-  
 scription taken from the wall in these words:

ANTONINO AUG. PIO P. P. COS. III.

At least, this inscription shews that the wall was  
 not built before that time. What Pausanias  
 mentions in his *Arcadicis* alludes to this trans-  
 action: “He amerced the Brigantes in Britain  
 “in a great deal of land, because they had in-  
 “vaded the land of the Venuves.” But Pau-  
 sanias is either mistaken in the name, or there  
 have been other Brigantes at that time, than  
 what we know of: because Venuvium (so Ruh-  
 nius reads it) is situate in the middle of the ter-  
 ritory which is now supposed to have belonged



to the Brigantes, and they are all placed within Hadrian's wall ; but the lands which were taken from them lie between the wall of Hadrian and that of Antoninus Pius : rejecting, therefore, the opinions of later writers, it is here that the Brigantes of Pausanias ought to be fought for. But the wall of Antoninus remained not long as a boundary : for the Scots and Picts, disdaining to be restrained by it, carried war into the province when M. Aurelius and L. Verus were emperors. Calpurnius Agricola, the proprætor, was sent to oppose them ; but he seems not to have restrained them within narrower limits than the wall of Hadrian. Xiphilinus † relates, from Dio, that, under the emperor Commodus, the people of the island passing over the wall, which lay between them and the Roman camp, committed great devastation, and cut off a Roman general with all his troops. Hereupon Commodus dispatched Ulpius Marcellus against them, who is said to have given them a terrible defeat ; but he did not confine them further than the wall of Hadrian : for even after the death of Al-

† Lib. lxxii.



binus, his successor, Dio writes, that not much less than the half of Britain belonged to the Romans, nor does he ever make mention of the other wall.

About the year 209, the emperor Severus, which is the greatest glory of his reign, “ made a wall “ in Britain from sea to sea, fortified with trenches “ and towers †.” And that this was the stone-wall, of which the vestiges are still to be seen, betwixt the Solway Frith and the mouth of the Tyne, is now unanimously acknowledged by all who have considered the subject with attention. Buchanan, Usher, and others believed, or affected to believe, that the wall of Severus was situate between the friths of Clyde and Forth: Bede maintains the contrary opinion, and asserts that that wall was not made of stone, but turf. For he imagined the wall of Hadrian to be that of Severus; the reason of which error I shall explain afterwards: but Spartianus refutes all their opinions, when he says, that “ *the wall was built near the rampart.*” Salmasius reads it, *murum aut vallum, the wall or rampart,*

† Spartianus, &c.



and has adopted that interpretation in his context; but it seems much better to retain the ancient reading, than to follow an innovation which is contrary to the authority of the copies; especially as it points out so properly the situation of the wall: for *apud vallum* signifies the same with *juxta vallum*, or *near the wall*, where it is certain that the stone-wall of the emperor Hadrian was erected. Nor do any inscriptions, or other authentic tokens, hitherto found in Scotland, shew, that the Romans staid there after the age of the emperor Antoninus. “Wherefore,” says Horsley\*, “if you grant, “that Severus built the wall, you need only “search for it in the northern part of England.” Besides, Dio says, that “at that time there “were two nations of the unconquered part of “the Britons, the Caledonii † and Mæatae ‡;

\* Britannia Romana, p. 118.

† “Antiquaries are much divided about the etymology of “Caledonia. Buchanan, though a native of the Highlands, “and of course conversant with the Galic language, is not “happy in his conjectures on that subject. *Calden*, according to him, signifies a hazel tree. From thence proceeds “the famous Caledonian forest, and the name of Caledonia,



“ the latter of whom dwelt near the wall which  
 “ divides the island, and the former beyond

“ It is amazing to observe, how a man of his learning, and  
 “ great abilities, could give in to such a puerile conceit.  
 “ But had Buchanan considered properly his native tongue,  
 “ he would have found that *Caultin*, and not *Calden*, signifies  
 “ a hazel tree ; and that there is no such a word as *Calden* to  
 “ be met with in the Galic language.

“ Dr. Lloyd, bishop of St. Asaph, derives Caledonia from  
 “ *Cilydion*, a British word, signifying *borderers*. The Cale-  
 “ donians, says that learned prelate, bordered on the Roman  
 “ province in Britain, and therefore were, with great propriety,  
 “ called *borderers*. The bishop did not consider that the  
 “ boundaries of the province were often changed. If we sup-  
 “ pose the wall constructed by Adrian marked out the limits  
 “ of the Roman empire in Britain, then the *Brigantes*, *Otta-*  
 “ *dini* and *Mæatæ*, had a much better title to the name of  
 “ *borderers* than the Caledonians. If the wall built by An-  
 “ toninus Pius is to be looked upon as the boundary of the  
 “ province, then it naturally should follow, that the Caledo-  
 “ nians did not acquire the name of *Cilydion*, or *borderers*, till  
 “ after the construction of that wall. But the passage men-  
 “ tioned from Lucan proves, that the name of Caledonians  
 “ made some noise in the world as early as the reign of Nero.  
 “ Thus the bishop’s etymon of Caledonia falls to the ground.

“ Camden, one of the best antiquaries that the world ever  
 “ produced, has endeavoured to give the etymon of Caledo-  
 “ nia. *Kaled*, observes that learned writer, is a British word,



“ them.” But it is certain, from Tacitus, that Caledonia began from the rampart of Antoninus.

“ which signifies *hard*. In the plural number it makes *Kaledion*,  
 “ and hence proceeds *Caledonii*, that is, a people, *hardy, rough*,  
 “ *uncivilized*, as northern nations generally are; a people  
 “ fierce in their temper, from the extreme coldness of their  
 “ climate; a people bold, forward, and intrepid, from the  
 “ abundance of their blood.

“ The severity of this observation on the national character of  
 “ the Caledonians does not at all favour the etymon produced by  
 “ Camden. If the name of *Kaledion* was first framed by the Bri-  
 “ tons of the south, it may be justly questioned, whether they  
 “ themselves, before the reign of Nero, were less *hard, rough*, and  
 “ *uncivilized*, than their neighbours of the north, or of course  
 “ less intitled to that name. But as every thing that falls  
 “ from so justly celebrated a writer, makes a great impression,  
 “ I confess this etymon had such weight with me, that I long  
 “ considered the word *Kaled* as the root of *Caledonii*. This led  
 “ me further into the subject; and I submit to the world,  
 “ with great deference to the great merit of Camden, the  
 “ additional observations I have made.

“ *KALÉD*, in both the antient British and Galic languages, signifies *hard*. In both these languages *in*, or *yn*, signifies *a country*. From the monosyllable *in* comes the diminutive *innis*, which in the Welsh and Galic is of the same import with the English word *island*. By joining *Kaled* and *in* together, we have *Caledin*, *a rough and mountainous country*; which is exactly the signification of *Alba*, the only



Wherefore, the *Mæatae* must have dwelt between these and the wall of Hadrian. It is said, more-

“ name by which the Highlanders distinguish Scotland to this  
 “ day.---This etymon of Caledonia is at least plausible: but  
 “ I must confess that the derivation given by Mr. Macpherson,  
 “ the translator of the poems of Ossian, is more simple and  
 “ natural.

“ The Highlanders, as he justly observes, call themselves  
 “ *Caël*. That division of Scotland which they possess they  
 “ universally call *Caëldoch*, that is to say, the country of the  
 “ *Caël* or *Celtes*. The Romans, by a transposition of the let-  
 “ ter *l*, in *Caël*, and changing the harsh *ch* of *doch*, into an  
 “ harmonious termination, formed the name of *Caledonia*.”

‡ During the invasion of the Romans, we find many other  
 “ tribes, besides the *Caledonians* and *Mæatae*, in the north of  
 “ Britain; though probably they were no more than subdivi-  
 “ sions of those two illustrious nations. Every one of those  
 “ tribes were governed by an independent chief, or petty  
 “ king. In Cæsar’s time there were no less than four such  
 “ chieftains in Kent, and each of them vested with regal au-  
 “ thority. The political government of Caledonia was, in  
 “ Domitian’s reign, much the same with that of Kent during  
 “ Cæsar’s proconsulship.

“ When the tribes of North Britain were attacked by the  
 “ Romans, they entered into associations, that by uniting  
 “ their strength, they might be the more able to repel the com-  
 “ mon enemy. The particular name of that tribe, which  
 “ either its superior power or military reputation placed at



over, that Severus amerced the Caledonii and Mæatae in a considerable part of their territory: but, soon after the death of that emperor, they obliged his son to restore it \*. From this time we do not find, that any alteration happened in regard to the wall, till the year 369, when

“ the head of the association, was the general name given by  
 “ the Romans to all the confederates.

“ Hence it is, that the Mæatae and Caledonians have in-  
 “ grossed all the glory which belonged in common, though,  
 “ in an inferior degree, to all the other nations settled of old  
 “ in North Britain. It was for the same reason that the name  
 “ of *Mæatae* was entirely forgotten by foreign writers after  
 “ the third century, and that of the Caledonians themselves  
 “ but seldom mentioned after the fourth.

“ The *Mæatae* were one of those tribes who were settled to  
 “ the south of the Clyde and the Forth. Ptolemy places the  
 “ *Gadeni, Salgovæ, Novantes*, and *Damnii*, in the same divi-  
 “ sion of the country. To the north of the friths the same  
 “ writer assigns their respective places to the *Caledonii, Epidii*,  
 “ *Carini, Cantæ, Logæ*, and several other small tribes. Without  
 “ insisting upon the probability that Ptolemy, an Egyptian,  
 “ was not so minutely acquainted with the internal state of  
 “ Britain as he pretends, at a time when the north of Europe  
 “ was so little known to men of letters, we shall take it for  
 “ granted, that all those nations he mentions were of the  
 “ same original stock.” MACPHERSON'S *Critical Dissertation*.

\* Herodian.



“ Theodosius repaired the fortifications ; watch-  
 “ men, and guards were placed on the bounda-  
 “ ries, and the province, which was retaken, got  
 “ the name of Valentia,” as Ammianus writes †.  
 Whence some, because what Gildas and Bede  
 relate of the walls which were built by the Ro-  
 mans in the fifth century, cannot be rightly  
 understood, unless the Romans left the British  
 in possession of the whole territory to the frith  
 of Forth, are of opinion that Valentia extended  
 to that boundary. But the authority of Bede  
 and Gildas is not sufficient to persuade us, that  
 the province, recovered by Theodosius, was the  
 same with that of which the Romans had been  
 deposed for more than two hundred years, and  
 had retained so short a time : for these writers  
 throw all into perplexity. I observed before,  
 that Bede mistakes the wall of Hadrian for that  
 of Severus : and as one error produces another,  
 he has fallen into several. He found that the  
 authors whom he copied, viz. Eutropius, Euse-  
 bius, Orosius, and Gildas, wrote of three walls, of  
 which one only is mentioned by the former three  
 authors, and two by Gildas. But there are three

† Lib. xxviii.



such walls found in Britain. While he was desirous of ascribing them to their proper builders, he asserted, with Gildas, that the stone wall was erected by the legion which was sent over under the last Honorius. The length of Severus's wall would not admit of its being situate between the Clyde and Forth; wherefore, he chose the wall of Hadrian in its place. The third wall still remained, which he ascribed to the legion sent hither in the year 414, although it is certain, that it was built by Lollius Urbicus in the reign of Antoninus Pius, as has been mentioned above: and thus he imagined he had assigned to each wall its proper builder. He had never read of the works of Hadrian and Antoninus: and their names being omitted in the catalogue of builders, he knew not to whom else he could attribute these works, than the persons he has named. But I am inclined rather to think, that the Britons repaired the turf wall of Hadrian in the year 414, and the stone wall of Severus in 416, which the above-mentioned authors imagined to be then first erected.

Nor is this opinion any thing invalidated by saying, that "The Picts and Scots, passed the valley



“ Tethyca† in their coracles, by the assistance  
 “ of sails and oars,” (for so I think it ought to  
 be read; a manner of expression not much unlike  
 what Ovid makes use of, when he calls the sea  
 a Field of Waters) because it was both usual and  
 necessary that the Scots and Picts, on the one  
 side of the Forth, should join with those on the  
 other, when they intended to attack the numer-  
 ous nation of the Britons: and in this way they  
 might be said to be carried over the frith of  
 Forth. Besides, there is no reason why, by the  
 valley Tethyca, another frith might not be  
 meant. For instance, had they passed through  
 the Solway Frith; and thence too they were

† In the oldest manuscript it is read *Tythicam vallem*,  
 whence, by a slight alteration, it may be changed into *Tetby-*  
*cam vallem*, which I imagine is the proper reading, derived  
 from the Tethys: for Gildas imitated the poets very much in  
 his diction and manner of expression. But Camden, in his  
 Britannia, cap. *Scoti*, says, “ Gildas calls it *Vallem Scythi-*  
*cam* (for so the Paris edition has it) where others, without  
 “ any meaning, read *Stythicam Vallem*.” There appears to be  
 little or no meaning in the reading he has adopted: and in  
 that which he rejects, it is highly probable, that the letter *s*,  
 by a very common mistake, has been taken from the end of  
 the word *trans*, and added to the beginning of that which fol-  
 lows it.



dreaded, as Gildas expressly affirms : wherefore, there also, “ on the shore of the ocean, towards “ the south, the Romans erected towers at proper “ distances in sight of the sea.” Nennius, likewise, in cap. 36. calls the sea or frith, which flows between Britannia and the country of the Saxons, by the same name. But whether by the valley of Tethyca be understood the frith of Forth, or that of Solway, it is manifest that both Bede and Gildas were mistaken, when they imagined that the two walls were erected entirely by these single legions, for no other reason, than that in the authors whom they had read they found no mention of the works of Hadrian and Antoninus. For though the silence of these authors acquits them of any suspicion of relating designedly what they knew to be false, it, by no means, evinces, that what they have related is true. But if any person contends, that these things are otherwise, I should be glad that he would shew, from any approved writer, at what time the Romans, after the emperor Antoninus, fixed their boundaries at the frith of Forth, that so he might vindicate Gildas and



Bede from the arguments here adduced against them. Horsley, who has investigated this subject with particular curiosity, is of opinion, that it was not done by Theodosius, as some would insist: "This," says he, "appears not so clear  
 "to me; I am inclined rather to think that our  
 "wall in the north part of England, and the  
 "towers upon it, are the fortifications mention-  
 "ed by Ammianus Mercellinus. I am fully per-  
 "suaded, that the wall of Severus was the most  
 "usual boundary of the Roman province; be-  
 "cause near the course of it are found many in-  
 "scriptions, relating as well to the earlier as  
 "later emperors; which cannot be said of the  
 "wall in Scotland. And this, in my opinion,  
 "is most conformable both to the testimony of  
 "historians, and the inscriptions and coins  
 "which have hitherto been found †." Thus  
 far Horsley, who was an Englishman, and would  
 not have made these concessions, could the con-  
 trary opinion have been supported with any de-  
 gree of plausibility; for, in accounting why the  
 Romans did not carry their conquests farther

† *Britannia Romana*, p. 73, and 118.



north, he alledges a reason no less invidious than false, viz. that the other parts of the island were of no value: and this he proves from Aurelius Victor, and Appianus Alexandrinus. But, in fact, the land, which lies between the walls of Severus and Antoninus, is preferable to that in the north of England; for Appianus says, that the Romans reaped little profit from the part of the island which they possessed. And, before him, Strabo: “ The Romans, though they could  
 “ easily have made themselves masters of Britain,  
 “ despised the conquest, when they saw that  
 “ there was no danger to be apprehended from  
 “ the inhabitants of the country, and that the  
 “ possession of it could not be of much advantage; for there seems to be more money reaped at present by the revenues, than the tribute could amount to, after deducting all the expences of the soldiery and tax-gatherers: and  
 “ it was apprehended, that such a conquest  
 “ would prove detrimental to the circumjacent  
 “ islands †.” But that such was the case, neither the authority of Strabo, Appian, or Victor, is sufficient to convince us. How much more

† Lib. ii. p. 115.



justly and acutely speaks Galgacus, as represented by Tacitus : “ Infatiable of conquest, the plunderers of the world, when they had ravaged every land, ranfacked the ocean for its spoil. If an enemy is rich, they are prompted to attack him by avarice ; if poor, they are impelled by ambition. Unparalleled in their thirst of dominion, they lust, with equal ardour, after the riches and poverty of all. They desolate the earth, yet speak of peace †”

But, in regard to Gildas and Bede, one thing deserves to be remarked. We are certain, from the history of the Romans, that there were three walls or ramparts erected in Britain above two hundred years before the arrival of the two legions, by whom they alledge two of them to have been raised. So that both they, and those who implicitly follow them, ascribe more achievements to these single legions, in the space of two summers, than to many legions, headed by the Roman emperors themselves, during all these two hundred years. For the Scots and Picts were twice driven out of the province, and amerced in territory within the walls : then

† Vit. Agricolaë, c. xxx.



two walls were drawn across the island, one of turf, and another of stone, with towers towards the south, on the sea-shore; which is not at all probable, especially if, as Horsley † writes, the stones, of which the wall was built, were not found in the adjacent country, but carried from some place at a distance. But that all these circumstances are entirely false, we have the testimony of the Roman writers, who inform us that these walls were erected long before. There remained nothing more, therefore, to be done by these legions, than that the first, perhaps, repaired the wall of Hadrian, and the other that of Severus.

That stone wall retains to this day, in the language of the Britons, the name of *Gual-Sever* †, from its founder; and by the English and Scots is called *Grimisdike*, which literally signifies the wall of Severus in their tongue: for they interpret Severus, *Grim*. And this etymology of the word is much more plausible than what some pretend to derive from *γρῶμας*, the Greek name for hillocks. It must be confessed, that the wall of Antoninus, as well as others in

† P. 123.

† Camden.



England, is likewise called *Grimisdike*; but, it is probable that they have been improperly so designed, from the name of the principal wall.

If these things are so, Buchanan, Tillemont, and others, have laboured in vain to prove, that the wall of Severus ran between the friths of Clyde and Forth. In vain also doth Buchanan call Bede to his assistance. Bede, indeed, imagined that the wall of Hadrian was built by Severus; in regard to the rest, he was entirely wrong: but he never said that Severus built the wall between these two friths, nor, indeed, did he so much as suppose it. I own, that in the *Annotations on Buchanan*, lib. i. after enumerating six lines of out-guards, as being drawn across the island, though in reality there were only three, these words are added: “truly Bede, “whom both Buchanan and Camden endeavour “to draw to their opinion, appears to be so uncertain and ambiguous in this point, that I “know not well whose sentiments to adopt: I “am inclined, however, to think that Buchanan “is right.” If this should be so, I have been arguing against Bede to no purpose. But when



Bede mentions first a turf wall, drawn between the two friths of which he had spoken, namely, Clyde and Forth, and afterwards mentions a stone wall, eight feet broad and twelve high, built on the same line where Severus had formerly erected one; and when there is no such stone wall, except that which runs from the Solway frith to Newcastle, I confess, I can see no ambiguity in Bede concerning the place where Severus's wall stood. For he mentions some places in the neighbourhood of that wall, as in hist. iii. 2. "Hefenfelth, called in Latin Cœlestus  
 "Campus, *the heavenly field*, is situate near that  
 "wall, on the north, where formerly the Ro-  
 "mans drew a wall from sea to sea, to guard  
 "Britannia from the incursions of the barbari-  
 "ans. This place has been long the resort of  
 "the brethern of \* \* \* \* \* church, which is  
 "not far distant." He also intimates, that the place near *the wall* was situate not far from the river Tyne; "near the wall," says he, "where  
 "formerly the Romans inclosed Britannia:" and, when copying Eusebius Hieronymianus in his chronicle, he makes the wall of Severus to be a hundred and thirty-two thousand paces in



length. All which circumstances clearly evince the situation in which he fixed the wall of Severus. And, it is observable, that Bede assigns the same boundaries to the Roman province with those for which I contend: “The Romans,” says he, “inhabited † the territory south of the wall, “which I have said Severus drew across the “island; which the towns, light-house, bridges, “and paved-ways, in those places, witness to “this day.” It deserves here to be remarked, that Bede considered the part of Britannia, beyond the wall of Severus, as an island. But as to what he subjoins, “the Romans, from a thirst “of dominion, held possession of the farther “parts of Britain, and even the islands that are “situate beyond Britain;” it cannot be admitted, upon any principle of common sense, if we allow, that, by the name of Britain, in this place, is understood the whole island to the extremity of Caledonia: nay, it cannot be said, with any propriety, though we should suppose that he makes Britain extend only to the frith of Edinburgh (for that the name is frequently used in

† Hist. Eccles. xi.



that acceptation, has been shewn above) since it would imply somewhat of absurdity to say, that the Romans, from a thirst of dominion, held possession of that territory, when, for three hundred years, the boundaries of their empire had been beyond it.



## C H A P. IX.

*Of the origin of the Picts, the catalogue of their  
kings, and the bounds of their kingdom.*

**I**T is now generally allowed that the Picts \*  
were Britons, who either had never been con-

“ \* It is generally believed, that the Picts derived their  
“ appellation from their characteristical custom of painting  
“ their bodies. This opinion seems to be supported by an  
“ expression of Claudian ; who shews, in another place, that  
“ the Picts continued the old practice of drawing the figures  
“ of animals on their limbs, after it had been abolished in  
“ South Britain. But when the fashion of painting in the  
“ same way was universal in Britain, it may be asked, why  
“ were not all the inhabitants called *Picts* by the Romans ?  
[ “ why were the Caledonians of the east distinguished by a  
“ name to which those of the west had the same right ; for it  
“ is certain they used the *Glastum* of Pliny, and the *Vitrum*  
“ of Mela, in common ? *Picti* is no more than an epithet :  
“ and as Virgil would have been guilty of an impropriety,  
“ had he called either the Geloni or Agathyrsi, *Picti*,  
“ without specifying the particuliar nation to which he ap-  
“ plied that epithet, so the Romans in Britain would have  
“ been guilty of the same solecism, had they called the  
“ eastern inhabitants of Caledonia *Picti*, without annexing  
“ a noun substantive to the adjective.



quered by the Romans, and lived on the north of their province, or had fled thither to shake

“ Upon weighing these difficulties, I am apt to believe,  
 “ that the name, out of which the Romans framed the designation of *Picti*, was originally a British one, and of a very  
 “ different signification from the Latin word, which is equivalent to *painted* in English. The name was very probably  
 “ framed by the Scots to the west, or the *Mæatae* to the  
 “ south; and as it may have been imposed after the expedition of Severus, it is no matter of wonder that it was unknown to all the Roman writers till the very end of the  
 “ third century.

“ After the reign of Caracalla, the design of conquering  
 “ North Britain seems to have been totally laid aside by the  
 “ Romans. The frequent competitions of rival emperors,  
 “ the public distractions unavoidably attending such contests,  
 “ and a long succession of princes, foolish, wicked and inactive, must have diverted their attention to other objects.  
 “ The barbarians of Caledonia had sense enough to avail  
 “ themselves of the advantages which an administration, so  
 “ feeble and uncertain, must have afforded them. They  
 “ made frequent incursions into the Roman provinces, and  
 “ met with little opposition. Not long after, Constantius  
 “ Chlorus came from the continent into Britain, with an intention to make war upon them; but he died at York,  
 “ before this design could be executed. It was probably  
 “ much about that time that the Romans discovered that  
 “ the most considerable nation among the unconquered Britons was called *Pictich*, a word corresponding in sound



off the Roman yoke ; to whom, because they retained the antient custom of painting their

“ with the *Picti* in Latin : accordingly we find that Eumenius, the panegyrist, is the first Roman author who mentioned that people under this new name.

“ In philological investigations of this kind, it is much easier to disapprove of the conjectures of others, than to offer a more rational one to the public. But as new opinions, which turn only on verbal criticism, are very innocent, though perhaps they may be ill founded, I shall venture to give a new etymon of the name of *Picti*.

“ The Highlanders, who speak the ancient language of Caledonia, express the name of that once famous nation, who were at last subdued by the Scots, by the word *Pictich*. They could not have borrowed this epithet from the Romans ; for the illiterate part of the Highlanders have no idea that the Romans were in this island, or ever existed : yet the name now under consideration is very familiar to their ears. One of the ideas affixed to the word *Pictidich*, or *Pictich*, is that odious one which the English express by the word *plunderer*, or rather thief. Therefore it is not improbable that their neighbours may have given that title to a people fond of depredation ; and Dion gives us to understand, that the barbarians of North Britain took a peculiar pleasure in robberies ; nor was this character, in these days of violence and ignorance, attended with much infamy : if the robber had the address to form, and the spirit to execute, his unjust schemes, he was rather proud



bodies, which had now been long disused by the provincial Britons, the Romans gave a suitable name. I am informed, however, that a living author, of no small reputation in the literary world, endeavours, in a treatise written professedly on this subject, to establish an opinion directly contrary to that which is here advanced; namely, that the Picts were no other than Saxons, who either in the time of the Romans, or before it, had fixed their residence on the east coast in the north part of Britain. On this position he imagines, that he can easily solve many difficult points which have hitherto not even been observed by others, much less understood. Among other matters, which he thinks are cleared up by this hypothesis, one is, that thence it is evident why the Saxon language continues to this day to be spoken, without any foreign mixture in that eastern part of the country. Who is so destitute of reason as not to see the force of his argu-

“ than ashamed of his conduct: all the honesty required at  
 “ his hands, was not to encroach on the property of a friend  
 “ or ally.”



ment? I fear it is contrary to the rule in logic, which forbids the making use of any proposition as certain, that requires most to be proved. I have not yet learned by what arguments this author supports his opinion; but if he succeeds no better in his attempt to establish it, than Antonius Pagi did formerly (for Antonius long ago asserted this very doctrine) whoever he be, he will not meet with much applause.

Antonius Pagi embraced this opinion, because he saw that the miraculous victory obtained by the Britons over the Saxons and Picts, under the conduct of Germanus Antissidorensis, could have no foundation in truth, unless the Saxons had occupied some parts of Britain before the arrival of Hengist and Horfa: for Germanus died on the last day of July 448, and Hengist and Horfa arrived not in Britain before the year following, that they were hired by the Britons.

About forty years after the death of Germanus, one Constantius attempted to write his life, when those mercenary Saxons, after having either butchered or expelled almost all the Britons, usurped the greatest and most fertile part



of the country to themselves. Constantius attending only to the state of affairs in his own time, has, in order to raise the honour of Germanus, forged the story of that victory over a people who had not then arrived in Britain.

Antonius Pagi, that he might support this tottering fable with a miracle, makes the Saxons to be the Scots or Caledonians; which he endeavours to confirm from these words of Claudian, in the fourth consulship of Honorius:

—— Maduerunt, Saxone fuso,  
Orcades. Incaluit Pictorum sanguine Thule.  
Scotorum cumulos flevit glacialis Hiberne.

And from Sidonius Apollinaris's panegyric on Avitus, v. 35. where he says of Julius Cæsar:

—— Victricia Cæsar  
Signa Caledonios transvexit ad usq; Britannos;  
Fuderit & quanquam Scotum, & cum Saxone  
Pictum.

As also from what Ammianus Marcellinus † writes, that about the year 463, the Picts, Saxons, Scots, and Attacotti, harassed the British continually.

† Lib. xxvi.



But it is amazing how he could infer from these passages, that the Saxons were Scots or Picts, when they are clearly named as distinct nations. And though the Romans, as Claudian says, overthrew the Saxons in the Orkneys, it does not necessarily follow, that these were inhabitants of the Orkneys, or even of Britain. Others before him have imagined that Claudian here speaks of Picts, who were defeated by the Romans in a sea-fight near the Orkneys; but, granting that it alludes to a victory obtained by land, is there any impropriety in supposing, that pirates, such as they always were, might land in another country, and there be either repulsed or overthrown? Sidonius Apollinaris, plainly alluding to the state of affairs as they were in his own time, ascribes to Julius Cæsar achievements he never performed, who certainly never defeated the Caledonians, Scots, or Saxons, nor even so much as saw them; wherefore Camden very justly reprehends Sidonius for this error †.

And though the Saxons infested the British in the time of Marcellinus, he gives not the smallest intimation that they were inhabitants of



Britain ; nay, he even affirms in lib. xxvii-viii. that they bordered with the Franks. All other interpreters are of opinion that he here speaks of the piracies which the Saxons practised ; and in this they are supported by the authority of Claudian, who, after Marcellinus had given over writing, if he was not dead, shews that the Saxons continued to annoy the British coasts, when he introduces Britannia returning thanks to Stilicho ||, that by his means she would no longer

*Prospiceret dubius venturum Saxona ventis.*

And in Eutrop. i. he represents Rome herself as congratulating him,

—— *domito quod Saxone Tethys*

*Mitior, aut fracto securo Britannia Picto.*

Antonius Pagi very justly observes, that the language of the English is now spoken over the eastern provinces of Scotland ; how this happens I shall afterwards have an opportunity to inquire ; but it makes nothing for Antonius's

|| In consulat. ii. Stilictionis, v. 255.



purpose, unless he could shew, that the English tongue was used there before the government of the Picts was overthrown; the contrary of which is evident from Bede, who himself spoke the Saxon. He not only writes, that the Picts spoke a different language, but in lib. i. 12. says, that the wall of Antoninus, “ began at a  
 “ place, which in the Pictish tongue is called  
 “ *Peansabel*, but in that of the English *Pen-*  
 “ *neltun*.” But to this day *Peansabel* signifies the beginning of a wall, in the language of the Britons. *Penneltun* is a corruption or abbreviation of the same Pictish or British word, with the addition of the monosyllable *tun*, which denotes a town in the English.

Lastly, the antient names of mountains, rivers, and places in the country, which the Picts inhabited, or the whole eastern part of the kingdom, express, both in the language of the Britons and Scots, a sense declarative of the nature or situation of these objects. And seeing that the language of the Scots, which still obtains in the western part of Scotland, is extremely different from the Saxon, as every body



knows, it affords an invincible argument, that neither the language nor nation of the Saxons were derived from that country.

In vain is Camden appealed to, who says, that the Scots in the west of Scotland call the inhabitants of the eastern part, Saxons; for in that assertion he was rash. They call the English only by that name, of whom many who fled from the tyranny of the Normans, obtained refuge and settlements in that country, as will afterwards be shewn.

The Picts therefore, since they were not Saxons but Britons, are not to be reckoned recent inhabitants, as some would contend, but of the same antiquity with these. Of what extent that was, we have not monuments to determine precisely, but it is certain that it was great. I fear that their records, which are said to have existed some time ago, are intirely perished §. Thomas Innes indeed, in a book which he published in 1729, relates many magnificent anecdotes concerning the Picts, of which

§ Vidi Innesii Tentamen Criticum, p. 118 and 678. qui tamen Forduni, lib. ii. c. 9 (in edit. Edinb. 10) ad hoc probandum frustra citat.



he boasts of being the only discoverer ; namely,  
 “ that they, and they only, were called, by the  
 “ ancients, Caledonians ; nay, that the Cale-  
 “ donians constituted only a part of their na-  
 “ tion ;” with other things of the like kind ;  
 all which he thinks appears evident from Eu-  
 menius’s panegyric on Constantius, where we  
 read \* *non dico Caledonum aliorumque Pictorum syl-*  
*vas, &c.* But that such a reading is erroneous,  
 Lindenbrogius and Valerius long since remarked  
 in Annotations on Am. Marcellinus, because in  
 manuscripts it reads, *non Dicaledonum aliorumque*  
*Pictorum sylvas*, which agree with the words of  
 Marcellinus himself. Valesius indeed subjoins,  
 that “ if any body chooses to follow the reading  
 “ in the common manuscripts, because Cale-  
 “ donia in Britain is mentioned by Tacitus, and  
 “ the Caledonians are called Britons by Clau-  
 “ dian and Aufonius, he will not be much  
 “ against it.” We however may oppose it, not  
 from a spirit of contradiction, for we argue only  
 for the sake of truth ; but first, because the  
 reading of the manuscripts ought always to be

\* Vide supra, p. 64.



preferred. 2dly, Because we do not find the Caledones mentioned for the Caledonii in any other place. 3dly, The passages produced from Tacitus, Claudian, and Ausonius do not in the least invalidate the authority of the manuscripts; nay, the reading of the manuscripts, as above quoted, is by far the most conformable to them and all the earlier writers †. When these things are attentively considered, I believe Innes will reap very little honour from his observation, in impotently endeavouring "on such weak, uncertain, and false arguments, to raise the antiquity of the Picts, and diminish that of the Scots. It is certain that the Roman writers do not mention the Picts, as inhabitants of Britain, either earlier or oftener than the Scots. What then is the foundation for all this prejudice?

But there still remains a large enough field, in which Innes may boast of the services he has rendered the Picts. For having obtained a list of seventy-seven of their kings, with the duration of the reign of each, he published them to the world. He framed also a chronological

† Vide p. 65, 66, &c.



table of the last forty, wherein the names and years of the kings were disposed according to order. He has expatiated at great length on some passages in antient writers, where the achievements of the Picts are mentioned; frequently animadverting on the envy of the Scotch Historians, as if, through emulation, they had detracted from the antiquity of the Picts, and curtailed the catalogue of their kings. And lastly, he contends that greater honour is derived to the monarchy and kings of Scotland, both in point of antiquity and fame, from the succession of the Pictish kings, than from all the race of their own.

Indeed, the glory of the Picts was not small, and they performed many noble achievements; they lived for several ages in the closest alliance with the Scots; and when united together, they were ready to repel or even invade any enemy, whether Romans or Britons; for I have sufficiently refuted above their pretended dissention, and the banishment of the Scots. That many of them were ingrafted, and that their race is still intermixed with the Scots, is not to be questioned. And though the case were otherwise, we ought



not, in historical investigations concerning them, either to dissemble or violate the truth. But, to be short, it is no difficult matter to prove, that the catalogue of Innes is intirely the work of some impostor.

Bede, who lived in the borders of the Pictish dominions, says, in treating of the succession of their kings, that “ where the case was doubtful, “ they chose a prince who was descended of “ their kings by the female line, rather than the “ male :” which custom, he says, still continued among them in his time. A doubtful case, I imagine, mostly happened when there was a contest between the direct and collateral lines ; as for instance, if a king at his death should leave son, or a grandson born of his daughter, the Picts preferred such issue to the brother of the deceased king, his son, or grandson ; or, in the direct line of succession, they held a grandson, born perhaps of a daughter, more eligible than a great grandson begotten of a son, especially if he was older. This, however, seems not to have been the practice of the Anglo-Saxons, among whom, if I mistake not, at that time, the sons or descendants of daughters were



excluded from the succession, as in France. But whatever might have been the custom in doubtful cases, which seldom happen, yet where there was no dubiety, it is certain from the words of Bede, and even independently of his authority, that the sons or grandsons of the deceased kings succeeded to the throne among the Picts, the same way as in the other nations around them. But in the catalogue or chronicle of Innes this is not the case: there, not only the names of the kings, but also of their fathers, are generally given; the latter of whom, it appears, never reigned; for none of their names is to be found in the list of the kings. For example, Brudeus the son of Meilochon is said to have reigned thirty years; but no mention is made that Meilochon ever reigned. Then Gartnaich the son of Domelch reigned twelve years; but the name of Domelch is not among those of the kings; and so of others. Had Innes attended to this, he certainly would not have disputed, from that chronicle, the lineal succession of the kings from father to son. The catalogue of the Pictish kings, which Fordun produces in his history of Scotland, is refuted by the same



arguments, as of no authenticity. But since he has delivered it simply in the form he received it, without any ostentation or fallacy, he deserves the less reprehension.

Nor had Innes any reason to boast so much of the chronology of his chronicle, when after the year 617, Cincoch the son of Luthrin has a reign of nineteen years ascribed to him in the chronological table, but in the chronicle itself only eleven. And afterwards, necessity so requiring, a year is added to the reign of Hurgus the son of Fergus, to fill up a chasm which otherwise would have miserably spoilt his computations.

The same Innes alledges, that the Scotch historians have been guilty of an error in what they relate of the subversion of the Pictish kingdom; “because in the most antient chronicle of eleven kings of the Scots, Kenneth is said to have reigned 16 years after the overthrow of the Picts, and to have died on Tuesday the 13th of February; which calculation, he affirms cannot correspond to the year 854, when they write that he died, but must fall in with the year 858 or 59.” But he is wrong; for it is clear that the contrary is fact. When this among other things



was seven years ago communicated to Thomas Ruddiman, he opposed Innes with somewhat too much vehemence, appealing to chronographers in an arithmetical question, which of its own nature is not subject to controversy.

Innes indeed is mistaken; but it follows not, therefore, that Kenneth actually died in the year 854, although the ides of April that year fell on a Tuesday; for the same happened in 860, in which his death is recorded in the chronicle of Melrose, and in the doggrel chronicle which is generally annexed to Fordun. Winton consents to this opinion when he writes that Kenneth died in 859, which, reckoning the beginning of the year from the 1st of January, is the same with 860. But I am more satisfied with the authority of that old chronicle, in which, 31 years after, there occurs another certain mark of time, namely, an eclipse of the sun on the day of St. Cyriacus, in the ninth year of Gregory, which, after searching many chronicles, I have not found was observed in any other part of the West. But the celebrated astronomer Al-Batani observed it at Aracta, in the year 891, on the 8th of August, which is the day of St. Cyriacus,



and happened that year on Sunday. But unless we grant the death of Kenneth to have happened in 860, the ninth year of Gregory will not coincide with the year 891. Lastly, six intire years, viz. from 854 to 860, seem to be super-added to the reign of Gregory, that the later atchievements of the kings might not anticipate their proper date: for, in several of the shorter chronicles, he is said to have reigned only twelve years; but Fordun and most of the recent historians relate, that he reigned eighteen. Some such adjustment of this point is necessary toward ascertaining the chronology of later events. Nor is the present case any thing singular; when sometimes there happen controversies among the historians of our neighbouring nation concerning the reigns of their ancient kings. I think, however, that the period of Kenneth's death deserves to be more particularly investigated. It is common for historians to express the duration of reigns by some round number of years, as if those were exactly completed, when in reality they are not. Whence it happens that when the years of several reigns are added together, they do not measure the precise duration



of time. Nay, if we except Ptolemy's astronomical canon of kings, there is scarcely any thing to be met with of tolerable accuracy on the subject; and even that canon, by its obscure construction, has been the means of leading people into error †.

† As an instance of this I might produce a writer in our own country, who, attempting an explanation of the weeks of Daniel, without sufficient abilities for the task, enveloped them in still greater darkness. He imagined, that the whole of the year in which any king died, was, in that canon, ascribed to the duration of the reign of the deceased king, when in fact it is imputed to his successor; and this unfortunate mistake rendered all the author's labour intirely useless. Nor was this surprizing, when Dionysius Petavius, a person conversant in these matters, exerted all his industry to discover the year and month of the death of Alexander the Great, and yet, for the very same reason, was unable to effect it. *De doct. temp. lib. x. c. 34. 41, 42.*



## C H A P. X.

*Of the name of Scotland, and the mutual boundaries  
of the Scots \* and Picts, &c.*

**I** HAVE shewn above, that the part of Scotland, situate beyond the Forth, and in ancient times reckoned an island, was then called

\* “ There is no reason why the Scots should be ashamed to  
“ acknowledge, that the origin of their name is involved in  
“ darkness; while that of Rome, the queen of nations, remains utterly inexplicable. Plutarch found and left it so.  
“ Solinus gives no less than four different etymons, all equally  
“ unsatisfactory. Why the capitals of Britain, France, and  
“ Portugal have been of old called Londinum, Lutetia, and  
“ Olyssippo, are questions which have not hitherto been sufficiently cleared up, and probably never shall.

“ All we know with certainty concerning the appellation  
“ of *Scot* amounts to this, that it must have been at first a  
“ term of reproach, and consequently framed by enemies,  
“ rather than assumed by the nation afterwards distinguished  
“ by that name. The Highlanders, the genuine posterity of  
“ the ancient Scots, are absolute strangers to the name, and  
“ have been so from the beginning of time. All those who  
“ speak the *Galic* language call themselves *Albanich*, and their  
“ country *Alba*.



Hibernia; and thence, that the Scots received sometimes the appellation of Hiber-

“ Contumelious appellations have been given in all ages,  
 “ not only to individuals, but to whole bodies of people,  
 “ through spite, or a satirical pleasantry natural to the human  
 “ race. The *Pæones* of Macedonia were a quarrelsome race  
 “ of men, and therefore were called *Pæones*. The Protestants  
 “ of France and the Low Countries were nick-named Hugenots and *Gueux*, because their adversaries studied to make  
 “ them ridiculous and contemptible. It is needless to multiply instances. The same ill-natured humour has been hitherto general, and will always continue so.

“ The Picts, who possessed originally the northern and eastern,  
 “ and in a latter period, also the more southern divisions of  
 “ North Britain, were at first more powerful than the Caledonians of the West. It is therefore easy to suppose, that the  
 “ Picts, from a principle of malevolence and pride, were ready  
 “ enough to traduce and ridicule their weaker neighbours of  
 “ Argyll. These two nations spoke the same language. In  
 “ the *Galic* tongue *Scode* signifies a corner, or small division of  
 “ a country. A corner of North Britain is the very name  
 “ which Gyraldus Cambrensis gave the little kingdom, which  
 “ the six sons of Muredus king of Ulster were said to have  
 “ erected in Scotland.

“ *Scott*, in *Galic*, is much the same with *little* or *contemptible*  
 “ in English; and *Scottan*, literally speaking, signifies a small  
 “ flock; metaphorically, it stands for a small body of men.  
 “ For some one of the reasons, couched under these disparaging  
 “ epithets, their malignant or sneering neighbours may



nian†. Afterwards, about the time of Vespasian, it obtained the name of Caledonia, and its inhabitants, that of Caledonians. But when the Romans found that it was possessed by two nations, of different language and manners, they called the one Picts, and the other Scots. Among the writers, whose works have been transmitted to us, the first who mentions the Scots is Porphyry, in the third century, as he is quoted by Hieronymus †: “Neither,” says he, “did Britons have given the opprobrious appellation of *Scot* to the ancestors of the Scots nation.

“The Allemans of Germany were at first an ignoble multitude, or a motley composition of many different tribes and nations. For that very reason, the reproachful name of *Allemans* was framed by those who hated and despised them. But the deformity of that designation was afterwards covered with laurels, like the blemish which gave Cæsar so much pain; and the whole Germanic body is now proud of the title, thought at first dishonourable. In the same way it may be naturally supposed, that the people of *Albany* were, after a course of ages, reconciled to the once disparaging name of *Scots*, upon finding that all other nations agreed in distinguishing them by it.”

MACPHERSON'S *Critical Dissertations*.

† Vide p.

‡ Epist. ad Ctesiphontem contra Pelagium.



“ tain, a country fruitful in princes, or the na-  
 “ tions of the Scots, and the barbarous people  
 “ round them, as far as the ocean, know any  
 “ thing of Moses and the prophets.” It appears  
 hence, that, in the opinion of Porphyry,  
 Scotland was not a recent nation. Usher || says,  
 that “ Porphyry here speaks of the nations of  
 “ Scotland situate without Britain.” But cer-  
 tainly the words mean not that the Scots were  
 removed farther than without the province of  
 Britain; nor is there any reason for having re-  
 course to Ireland. For though the word *pro-*  
*vince* is not expressed, it ought to be understood:  
 who knows not, that the Romans used to call their  
 province Britain, and the inhabitants, Britains? It  
 makes nothing to Usher’s purpose that the na-  
 tion of the Scots is mentioned in the plural num-  
 ber, *Scoticæ gentes*, *the Scotch nations*; for when  
 we consider that such a manner of speaking was  
 frequent among the Greeks, it will not appear  
 strange that Porphyry should make use of it,  
 though he meant only one nation.

Innes † proceeds in a very different method,  
 and affirms, that “ whatever Hieronymus may



“ say, these are not the words of Porphyry,  
 “ but of Hieronymus himself: that Porphyry  
 “ wrote in the year 267, when as yet there were  
 “ no princes in Britain to correspond to the al-  
 “ lusion there made, which could not have any  
 “ reference before the age of Hieronymus, when  
 “ Caraunus, Aleetus, Maximus, Marcus, Gra-  
 “ tianus, Constantinus, and Gerontius had  
 “ usurped the government.” But Gildas under-  
 stood the passage to apply to the princes who  
 were in Britain before the arrival of the Romans.  
 Nor had Porphyry written these books in 267,  
 in which year he first went to Sicily, so much  
 oppressed with a melancholic disorder, that, he  
 confesses, he meditated to take away his own life †.  
 After he he had staid there for some years, he  
 discharged his splenetic humours upon the Chris-  
 tians; when, beside thirty kings who are supposed  
 to have exercised dominion in Britain, there arose  
 Proculus and Bonofus, of whom the last was a  
 Briton ‡ by birth, who all “ claimed the love-  
 “ reignty of the island to themselves\*.” Another  
 ruler of Britain, likewise, who had been appointed

† In Vita Plotini, c. xi.

‡ Hist. Aug. p. 942. 969.

\* Zosim. lib. i.



by the emperor Probus, was, on raising a sedition, treacherously killed by Victorinus. It appears, from these instances, that the province of Britain always abounded in princes: wherefore Hieronymus is wrongfully accused by Innes as guilty of an open falshood. For, although the name of any of the princes of those times cannot be produced, there is reason to suppose, that he has very justly added the epithet of abounding in princes. Leaving, therefore, the arguments of Innes, as of no importance, we may boldly assert, with Hieronymus, this testimony of Porphyry concerning the Scots. The subsequent writers, Epiphanius\*, Marcellinus, Pacatus Panegyricus, Claudian, Hieronymus, Prosper, &c. have always made mention of the Scots, even when we do not find, as I observed above†, that the country was yet commonly called Scotland. Indeed, in the book on the destruction of Jerusalem, ascribed to Hegesippus, Josephus is introduced as thus addressing the Jews concerning the Romans: “What should  
“you have to do with the conquerors of the

\* In Ancoratu, c. 115.

† P. 43.



“ whole world ; people by whom all the islands  
 “ in the ocean, and the extremities of India,  
 “ have been explored || ? Why need I add the  
 “ Britains, which, though separated from the  
 “ world by the sea, are yet reduced to the uni-  
 “ versal dominion of the Romans ? The moun-  
 “ tains of Scotland tremble at their name. Even  
 “ Saxony trembles in the midst of her impene-  
 “ trable marshes, and the impervious regions  
 “ that surround her ; which, though abounding  
 “ in a warlike race of men, has often swelled  
 “ the Roman triumphs with its captives ; people  
 “ strong of constitution, and surpassing other  
 “ pirates ; but who depend upon their vessels,  
 “ not their force, and are more ready for flight  
 “ than the battle.” By which, says Usher, “ he  
 “ plainly intimates Ireland, under the name of  
 “ Scotland, in making it to be an island separate  
 “ from other land, as Camden also has remark-  
 “ ed.” In this he is joined by Stillingfleet, Ni-  
 cholson, and other English writers. But, I  
 trust, that I have entirely refuted this Achillean

|| It is read so in a manuscript copy of the eleventh century,  
 as is remarked in the margins of some of the printed books,  
 while in the text it is read *parent*.



argument of theirs, with which they constantly attack us, namely, that Scotland is not an island, when I have proved, that it was considered by the ancients as an island, for several ages before they had the faintest idea of the existence of such a country as Ireland. Wherefore, the author must be understood, in this passage, as speaking of Scotland; for this additional reason, likewise, that the Romans had wars with Scotland, but never with Ireland.

But in what age Hegefippus lived is a subject of controversy. Vossius \* concluded, that he wrote after the year 968, from what he says of Antiochia †: “ A city formerly esteemed the  
 “ third in rank of all which the Romans possessed,  
 “ and now reckoned the fourth since the building  
 “ of Constantinople; formerly the capital of the  
 “ Persians, but now a barrier against them.” Which, he thinks, could not be said till that year, when Antioch was taken from the Saracens by Nicephorus Phocas: and he is of opinion, that this passage cannot be understood of the reduction of Antioch by the commanders of

\* De hist. Græc. ii. 14.

† Lib. iii. c. 5.



the holy war in the year 1118. Indeed, the copies of this book, which were written before that expedition, sufficiently invalidate any such conjecture; and he, who was acquainted with the writings of all the Greek and Latin historians, ought to have reflected, whether there was any author of a later date, whose diction and phraseology were more conformable to those of the purest ages. But Jo. Fred. Gronovius has put an end to this controversy; he asserts that work to be the production either of Ambrose of Milan, whose name some of the manuscripts, as well as the older printed copies, bear, or of some other person about the time of Theodosius, who refers this passage rather to the age of the emperor Jovian \*. Therefore he seems to be the first of the writers, now extant, who makes use of the word Scotland as the name of the kingdom. Let me observe, by the way, that the manuscript copies have not the pericope, which, in the printed ones, immediately follow the words above recited; but what precedes defends us from Usher,

\* Observ. in Script. Ecclesiast.



Joseph Gorionides is usually mentioned on this subject, who, in lib. vi. cap. 37. says, that the Roman empire reached “ to the ends of the  
 “ earth, in Britain as far as the ocean, and over  
 “ all Scotland, which is surrounded with water:  
 “ the inhabitants of which, like the Anakims,  
 “ are tall of stature and warlike, and are taught  
 “ to fight their enemies either with the chariot  
 “ or bow. Against these the Roman general led  
 “ his forces. But the Scots, assembling together,  
 “ and holding a council of war, cried out with  
 “ one unanimous voice, *Let us fight against our*  
 “ *enemies, and rather die bravely in the field, than*  
 “ *live the slaves of foreign masters.* But the Ro-  
 “ mans overcame them, and reduced them to  
 “ subjection.” This, and every thing else,  
 against both the evidence of history and the  
 genius of the people, Usher arrogates to his Ire-  
 land, because Scotland is described as an island;  
 which argument I have already refuted. Even  
 though Gorionides calls the island Ireland, not  
 Hibernia, or Scotland, and its inhabitants Irish,  
 by their proper name, it is well known that he  
 is a later author; and it still makes something



for our purpose, that he describes Scotland as an island, after the example of the ancients.

Usher† is of opinion, that no writer can be produced, before the eleventh century, who gives Albany the appellation of Scotland: Bede, in particular, contends, that Scotland was always the same with Hibernia, or Ireland; and the English and Irish regard his decisions as oracles. Indeed, Bede, either from an imperfect knowledge of the situation of places, or the records from which he compiled, writes sometimes so confusedly and obscurely, that it is difficult to determine what country he understands either by Hibernia or Scotland. It is evident, however, that he often applies the appellation of Albany to Scotland. For when he says, in book iii. c. 3. that the island Hii, whence bishop Aiden was sent to preach the Christian faith to the Northumbrians, pertained to the government of Britain, he mentions expressly, that Aiden's successors in the bishopric, who were sent from the same island, came from Scotland‡; and that Colman, the last of them, after ending the dispute with Wilfrid

† P. 383.

‡ Vid. lib. iii. 3, 4, 5. 17. 25, 26.



concerning the communion, returned to Scotland, to the same island Hii, whence he afterwards retired to a small island a little west of Hibernia, called, in the Scotch tongue, Inisboufinde; all which shew clearly, in opposition to Usher, that our country was mentioned by Bede under the appellation of Scotland.

Abbot Ceolfrid is quoted, who writes that abbot Adamnan (after he had discharged the office of legate from his country to Alfrid king of England) when he returned to Scotland, induced great numbers of the people of that nation, by his preaching, to the religious observance of Easter; which Usher would explain from Bede, who, in hist. v. 15. has these words concerning him: "He sailed to Hibernia, and converted  
" many of the inhabitants to the catholic faith." Ceolfrid says, that Adamnan returned to Scotland; but as Scotland was the country he departed from, he certainly could not be said to return to any other: and the words of Bede only shew, that Ceolfrid was mistaken, in that Adamnan reformed many of the inhabitants of his country, when Bede expressly affirms that he first returned home, and after having in vain



attempted a reformation, failed to Hibernia, whence, when he had met with great success, and celebrated the paschal feast, he again returned to his own country, where he died before the Easter following.

Toward the end of the same eighth century, Alcuin \* thus writes, in a letter to Offa king of the Mercians: “ He (Charles M.) directed  
 “ presents to be sent to king Ethelred and his  
 “ bishops; but, alas! the presents and letters  
 “ were no sooner delivered to the messengers,  
 “ than grievous tidings arrived from Scotland  
 “ of the infidelity of the nation and the murder  
 “ of the king. Hereupon Charles, retracting  
 “ the presents, burst forth into rage against that  
 “ nation, calling the people perfidious, refrac-  
 “ tory, murderers of their masters, and worse  
 “ than pagans; so that, had I not interceded  
 “ in their behalf, he would have pursued them  
 “ with the warmest resentment.” Alcuin speaks expressly of Ethelred, the son of Ethelwold, king of the Northumbrians, being murdered by his own people, in the month of April, 794.

\* Will. Malmeſbur. Hiſt. i. 4,



It is surprising, therefore, that Thomas Carte †, an Englishman, should take his intelligence, relating to a king of the western part of England, not from his own country, but from Offa, who died two years before. But with this we have nothing to do. It makes for our purpose that Alcuin remarks, that the legates of Charles the Great returned that year from Scotland through England. Had Thomas Ruddiman attended to this, he would have been under no necessity of having recourse to reasoning only, for confirming the reality of a literary correspondence between Charles and the kings of Scotland ‡.

In Bede, and other later writers, Ireland is frequently spoken of by the name of Scotland: for there arose no little confusion after the name of Hibernia, (which was formerly applied to the north part of Great Britain) began to be given to Ireland; in so much, that a reader, not sufficiently attentive, will imagine things to be said of Ireland which clearly refer to Scotland. Of this kind seems to me an expedition, men-

† Hist. Angl. vol. i. p. 270.

‡ Præfat. ad Anderfoni diplom. Scotiæ, p. 22.



tioned in the French history, of a fleet of Normans, which unsuccessfully attacked Hibernia, the island of the Scots, in the year 812.

Those of our side, as has been already observed, neither acknowledge the name of the Scots in their own language, nor allow that their country was called Scotland; but after the Picts were overthrown, the part of the country which they had possessed, from the frith of Forth northward, was called Scotland. The kingdom was divided into Lothian, Scotia, Galloway, and Ergadia; the two last of which, lying on the west, were occupied by the Scots, and the two other, in the east part of the country, were formerly inhabited by the Picts. Lothian antiently extended from the river Tweed to the frith of Edinburgh, or Forth, as appears from various papers and records\*. Under the name of Galloway was comprehended the tract of land between the friths of Solway and Clyde. Whence, in the charters of David I. the town of Irwine is said to be in Galloway†. And from the same,

\* Vide Skene de V. S. voce Scotia. Hoveden ad ann. 1188. p. 642, &c.

† Apud Strath-Irevin in Gal.



and other authorities, it appears, that Keil, Cuninghame, and the town of Renfrew, constituted part of Galloway †. That Ergadia formerly comprehended the whole western side of the country, from the frith of Clyde to the northern extremity of the island, is not to be questioned; when, even in the time of king Robert II. the land of Gerloch, which is situate a little north of the isle of Sky, was reckoned in Ergadia ‖: and, in the charters granted by Robert I. to Thomas Randolph, earl of Moray, Lochabre, Maymore, Lorcharketh, Glengareth, and Glenelgis, as far as Ross, and even Ross itself, are said to be in North Ergadia. Almost all these facts are evident from the answer of the Scotch nobles to the king of France, which will afterwards be recited, and from the antient laws of Scotland, although Ergadia began to be reduced within narrower limits than formerly.

The same laws inform us of the situation of what was called the back of Albany, which an-

† Chart. eccl. Glasg. fol. 2.

‖ Confirmatio donat. comitis Rossie Paulo Maftayre, de terra de Gerloch, viii Maii anno regni Ro. II. secundo.



ciently separated the Scots from the Picts; for, in book i. chap. 17. of Authentic Manuscripts, are these words: “If an accused person finds surety between Forth and Drumalban, or between Spey and Forth, let it be sustained,” &c. where these words, between Spey and Forth, shew what is understood to be comprehended between Forth and Drumalban. By Drumalban, then, was understood the tract of mountains which extend from Breadalbane along the sides of the Spey almost to the mouth of it. In most manuscripts there is this corrupt reading, “between Forth and Drumalban *et forte*, [and *peradventure*],” &c. Skene, not apprehending, that the passage was any thing defective, thought rather that the words *et forte* were a redundancy; for which reason he expunged them. But that this, which I have adopted, is the true reading, appears from what follows in the same chapter: for Moray, Ross, Cathness, Ergadia, &c. are said to be beyond Drumalban. Hence may be seen how vainly Innes has laboured to place Drumalban some where else; and also how rashly and unlearnedly both he †, and Usher ‡, in order to con-

† Tentamen Critic. p. 87.

‡ P. 321.



tract the limits of Scotland as much as possible, have strained all their nerves to reduce its ancient extent within Cantire, Knapdale, Lorn, Argylshire, now so called, Breadalbane and the isles; affirming, that their possessions extended no farther in Dalrieta, or Ergadia, when it is certain that they occupied not only Ergadia, but Galloway. For all the names of the old places in Galloway are Scotch; and Buchanan writes, that even in his time, in Galloway, the antient language of the country was generally spoken \*. But Innes †, and after him Guthrie ‡, and Carte †, either from negligence or wantonness, contend that the provincial language was Welsh, entirely contrary to the opinion of Buchanan, as will appear to any who reads him. And what renders these authors utterly inexcusable is, that Buchanan produces and interprets some words of the language of Galloway, which are not Welsh, but Scotch: such as *rinum*, the *point*; *mula*, the *beak* †, &c. Hence, the reader may remark, with what care and attention some

\* Lib. ii. p. m. 34:

† Tentamen Critic. p. 39:

‡ Hist. Angl. vol. i. 147. 470. 515.

† Hist. Angl.

vol. i. p. 264:

† Lib. i. p. 8.



authors write the history of kingdoms. What has been said may suffice of the word Scotland, and the boundaries of the Scots and Picts between themselves.



## C H A P. XI.

*Of the boundaries of the Scots and Picts, from the arrival of the Saxons, to the time of the Normans.*

I HAVE shewn, in the eighth chapter, that the Scots and Picts possessed the territory from the wall of Severus to the extremity of the island, during the whole time of the Romans, excepting a few years under the government of Antoninus Pius. Bede writes, that the Saxons drove the Picts farther †: but whether he means their expulsion from the Roman province, or rather that he has designedly added this, because he was ashamed it should be thought that his countrymen were undeserving of their pay, Gildas thinks to be doubtful; who says, that “they lied, in affirming, that they would  
“expose themselves to great dangers for the  
“safety of their good landlords.” It is certain, from Bede himself, that, even in his time, the Picts inhabited the territory north of the Solway frith and the river Tweed. He relates, that

† Hist. Eccl. i. 16.



Cudbert, “going from his monastery at Carlisle to the country of the Picts, called Nithsdale, “arrived on board a vessel:” that is, passing the Solway frith, he landed in the country of the Picts, about the mouth of the river Nith. At that time, therefore, the Picts possessed the country as far as to that frith.

But we learn from Bede, that the Scots and Picts, who occupied the northern parts of Britain, were mostly conquered, and rendered tributary by Osuiu king of the Northumbrians, who began to reign in the year 642; and that Trumvin, an Englishman, who, in the year 681, was appointed a bishop in the province of the Picts, which at that time was subject to the English government, got, for his residence, the monastery of Aebbercurnig (now Abercorn) near the frith of Forth. Likewise, in the year 671, Aebba, aunt of Ecgfrid king of the Northumbrians, was abbess of the monastery of Colud, now Coldingham. He also names others among the English, who, at that time, were abbots of the monastery of Melrose; such as Boifil, between the year 651 and 664, and after



him Cuthbert. All which I readily grant, provided that the northern limits of Britain be confined to the frith of Forth ; which has been shewn, in chapter fifth, to have been often done by writers. And that this passage ought to be interpreted in that sense, no body, that I know of, ever doubted, or so much as dreamt that the kings of the Northumbrians conquered and made tributary the Scots and Picts beyond the Forth, but only those on the south of the Forth and Clyde : and even when that part of them was reduced by the Northumbrians, it is evident that they, and not the English, continued to possess the country, although the kings of the latter, by virtue of their sovereignty, retained the power of presenting their friends and countrymen to monasteries, and other lucrative benefices. The more ancient English writers, who extend the kingdom of the Bernicii to the frith of Forth, are not to be interpreted, as if they meant that the possessions of that people actually reached so far, but only their sovereignty. Camden, therefore, and after him Usher, have entirely lost their labour, while they endeavoured to



prove the contrary, by producing a long catalogue of writers.

At what time this sovereignty was obtained, and when lost, we are informed by Bede in book ii. chap. 5. Aedilber, king of Kent, “ the  
 “ third among the kings of England, reigned  
 “ over all the southern provinces of the people  
 “ who are bounded on the north by the Humber  
 “ and adjacent limits.—For the first who ob-  
 “ tained this sovereignty was Aellus, king of  
 “ the South Saxons; the second, Cealin, king  
 “ of the West Saxons, who is called, in their  
 “ language, Ceaulin; the third, as I have said,  
 “ was Ædilbert, king of Kent; the fourth,  
 “ Reduald, king of the Eastern English, who,  
 “ even in the life-time of Ædibert, had raised  
 “ his own nation to eminence; the fifth, Æduin,  
 “ king of the Nordanhymbri, the people who live  
 “ north of the river Humber, the most power-  
 “ ful of all the nations in Britain; he ruled at  
 “ once over the English and Britons, except the  
 “ inhabitants of Kent, and also reduced in sub-  
 “ jection to the English the islands of Menaviæ,  
 “ belonging to the Britons, and situate between  
 “ Britain and Hibernia: the sixth, Oswald, the



“ most religious king of the Nordanhymbrī, who  
 “ maintained the same possessions ; the seventh,  
 “ Ofuiū, his brother, who, after confining his  
 “ dominion within the same limits for some time,  
 “ also conquered and made tributary the greatest  
 “ part of the Scots and Picts, the nations who  
 “ inhabit the north parts of Britain. But of  
 “ this afterwards.” These facts seem to be re-  
 lated with so much certainty and precision, that  
 it is beyond a possibility of doubt, that before  
 the time of Ofuiū, the Scots and Picts were en-  
 tirely free from any subjection to the English. In  
 what year this prince reduced them, is difficult  
 to determine ; only it is certain, that it did not  
 happen before 655, because, till that time, he  
 found sufficient employment in his own do-  
 minions. Both himself and his subjects were  
 so much harassed\* by the intolerable injuries  
 and irruptions of Penda, king of the Mercians,  
 who had killed his brother Oswald, and retained  
 his son and heir as an hostage, that he was able  
 to raise only a very small army, even in the  
 greatest extremity. Neither do I think that it

\* Bed. Hist. Eccl. iii. 24.



happened immediately after the death of Penda, and the reduction of the Mercians, or before the dispute between Colman and Wilfrid about the sacrament and shaving, in the year 654; after which period, it is probable, that not only those who followed the ecclesiastical rites of the Scots were expelled †, but also that a religious war was excited by Wilfrid. And Bede intimates, pretty clearly, that the Picts were conquered after the Mercians ‡: “King Oswin,” says, he, “three years after king Penda was killed, ruled over the nation of the Mercians, and the other people of the southern provinces; who also reduced the greatest part of the Picts in subjection to the English.” Though these things are so clearly related by him oftener than once, yet Bede himself strangely confounds them, when in another place he says, “he received into subjection all the nations and provinces of Britain, which are divided into four languages, those of the Britons, Picts, Scots, and English.” This passage is so directly repugnant to what has formerly been quoted, that one would

† Bed. Hist. Eccl. iii. 25. v. 19. Vita Cuthbereti, c. 7.

‡ Ibid. iii. 24.



scarcely imagine them to be written by the same hand. For there, he is said to have reigned over the English and Britons only, nor these universally, for the people of Kent are excepted: but here, it is affirmed, that he reigned not only over all these, but the Scots and Picts also. In the reign of Ædwin, Oswald and his brethren, with many of the young nobility, lived seventeen years in exile in the country of the Scots and Picts; among whom, especially the Scots, they were instructed in and embraced the Christian religion. Upon his return he sent messengers to the Scots, requesting to have a bishop who might preach the gospel to his subjects; and during his whole life he cultivated a close friendship with that nation, as we learn from Bede in another place, who indeed is too often inconsistent with himself. There is no reason, therefore, to believe that the Northumbrians obtained a sovereignty over the Picts and Scots beyond the Forth before the year 665. And although it could really be credited, it would make but little for the purpose of the modern English historians, who vainly pretend, that the



Saxons, from their first arrival, not only held the sovereignty over these people, but actually inhabited their country.

In the year 685, Ecgfrid, king of the Nordanhumbri, “ when he had rashly led his army to “ plunder the province of the Picts, was drawn, “ by a pretended flight of the enemy, into a narrow pass among inaccessible mountains, and “ cut off, with the greatest part of his troops, “ on the 28th of May. From that period, the “ hopes and valour of the English monarchy began to decline ; for not only the Picts recovered their possessions, but the Scots who were “ in Britain, as also a part of the Britons, regained their liberty, which they have now enjoyed forty-six years.” Simeon Dunelmensis, himself an inhabitant of Northumberland, says, “ that the king died at Nechtanesmere,” Nechtan’s-lake, now called Nenthorn-loch, in the Mers, a little way from the Tweed, near the village Nenthorn. In the bull of pope Honorius III. A. D. 1217, this village is called *Naythinthern*, Nechtan’s tower. It is evident, therefore, that the province of the Picts still reached, at least, as far as the Tweed.



However, Bede's account of these things is not altogether free from contradiction: "Among  
 " many of the English," says he, " who were  
 " either killed with the sword, reduced to slavery,  
 " or fled from the land of the Picts, the reve-  
 " rend man of God, Trumwin, who had been a  
 " bishop among them, retired with his family  
 " from the monastery of Æbbercurnig, situate  
 " in the country of the English, but in the  
 " neighbourhood of the frith which divides the  
 " the territories of the English and Picts, to the  
 " monastery of Streanaeshalch." What he had  
 formerly said to be in the province of the Picts,  
 he makes here to be in the country of the Eng-  
 lish; telling us, that Trumwin fled from Æb-  
 bercurnig in the country of the Picts, and im-  
 mediately subjoining, that the frith, which is  
 north of Æbbercurnig, was the boundary of  
 Scotch and English dominions. Hence we may  
 see with what caution even the most upright of  
 the English historians ought to be read and at-  
 tended to. It appears, from what has been said,  
 that the English exercised dominion over the  
 Scots and Picts, who inhabited the southern  
 part of Scotland, beyond the friths of Forth and



Clyde, and exacted tribute from them for almost twenty years, till routing Ecgfrid in battle, in 685, they entirely threw off the yoke. The kingdom of the Northumbrians, the most powerful of all which the Anglo-Saxons possessed, was so much broken by this defeat, as never after to recover it. The Picts and Scots enjoyed their possessions until, in the next century, “Kinadius, the son of Alpin” (as Higden says, on the authority of Giraldus †) “invaded Pictland, “destroyed the inhabitants, conquered Saxony “six times, and usurped the whole territory “from the Scottish sea to the river Tweed.” He relates similar facts of Kinadius and the Picts in another place; but has erred in thinking that the Picts endured the yoke of the Anglo-Saxons till the time of Kinadius †.

Wherefore, though bishop Trumwin held the monastery of Æbbercurnig, and Æbba the town of Coldingham, these places were not in the province of the English, but the Picts; and the reversionary possession of them happened within the period of the twenty years

† Polychron. p. 210.

† Ibid. p. 194.



above-mentioned. The monastery of Æbba was entirely consumed by fire in the life-time of Ecgfrid \*; and, upon his being slain, Trumwin fled from the country of the enemy. As to the monastery of Melrose, it seems to have been without the province of the English; because Cuthbert, among others who observed the Scottish rites, when driven home from their province, returned to that monastery †, of which he was appointed abbot. But the ancient monastery of Melrose was not situate in the same spot in which David I. king of Scotland erected his monastery, but was almost surrounded by a winding of the Tweed, as Afferius writes ‡. The same is the case of White-house. The White-house of S. Ninias was not in Galloway, but in the country of the Britons; whom we have shewn, in chap. viii. to have lived in the time of that person certainly, and indeed always, on the south of Severus's wall: "White-house," says William of Malmesbury, "in the extremity of England, near Scotland ||." What he means by the extremity, appears from book i.

\* Bede iv. 25.

† Ibid. iv. 19. et in Vita Cuth-

berti, c. 8, 9.

‡ Ad annum 705.

|| P. 272.



p. 21. of his history: "In the remote part of  
 " Britain, near Scotland, is the place where  
 " Bede was born and educated." Where, it is  
 evident, that he comprehends Britain within  
 the wall of Severus. That bishoprick had been  
 neglected for many ages; and when, after the  
 time of king Alexander I. a bishopric was insti-  
 tuted in Galloway, it got the name of White-  
 house, though the building was not on the spot  
 where Ninias resided, but only near it. In the  
 same manner the bishops of Westchester, after  
 the year 883, were called Lindisfarne; and the  
 bishops of the western isles, when the Isle of Man  
 was taken from the English, during the civil  
 wars of the Scots, were called Bishops of Sodor.  
 It seemed necessary to elucidate this matter at  
 greater length, as an author, no less learned  
 than upright, Robert Gordon†, by not sufficiently  
 attending to the order of transactions, has been  
 led into an error concernig it.

† Vide Atlantem Blavianum, vol. vi. p. 5.



## C H A P. XII.

*A refutation of those who write that the English possessed Lothian and Edinburgh.*

CAMDEN \*, Innes †, Usher ‡, and those who have adopted their authorities, Carte † and Guthrie endeavour to shew by various testimonies and examples, that every thing concerning the part of Scotland, situate beyond the Forth, is quite otherwise than has been above represented : “ contending, that it is evident “ from the Saxon chronicle of 1091, that about “ the year 960, long after the kingdom of the “ Picts was overthrown, while Indulphus reigned “ in Scotland, the English lost Edinburgh, the “ capital of Lothian ; that fifteen years afterwards, according to Matthæus Florilegus, “ Edgar king of England resigned the rest of “ Lothian to the king of Scots ; but notwithstanding which, that even long after the time “ of the Normans, it was still considered as

\* P. 687. cap. Lauden.

† P. 32.

‡ P. 350.

† Vol. I. p. 320, 329, 330. 675. vol. II. p. 212, 213. 216. 218.



“ situate in England, and constituting part of  
 “ that kingdom.” Such, according to them,  
 was the state of the eastern part of the country  
 south of the Forth, to that time. But concern-  
 ing the western, they relate “ that from the time  
 “ of the Romans the Britons still retained the  
 “ kingdom to themselves, the chief town  
 “ whereof was Alcluith, which was utterly de-  
 “ molished by the Daci in the year 869: that  
 “ the kingdom, however, was still maintained  
 “ by the Britons, and celebrated by the writers  
 “ of those times under the name of the Cum-  
 “ brian kingdom, otherwise called the kingdom  
 “ of Stralhclud, Stradclut, and Areclut, from  
 “ the river Cluid in Scotland, or the town of  
 “ of Archuid, and had its own kings till the end  
 “ of the Saxon monarchy, when the Normans  
 “ assumed the sway.” Many other things of  
 the same nature they expatiate upon at great  
 length, but whether learnedly or not, we shall  
 now proceed to inquire.

The antient writer of the history of the  
 twelve kings of Scotland, from Kenneth of Al-  
 pin, relates, “ that, in the reign of Indulphus,  
 “ the town of Eden was evacuated, and left to



“ the Scots even to his time.” The authors above-mentioned, without any authority, understand by this passage that the English evacuated Edinburgh, which had been voluntarily resigned to the Scots by king Edgar. But granting that the words actually referred to that town, it ought to be said that it was evacuated by the Picts and Danes, and not by the English, who are intirely out of the question. I imagine, however, that it is rather some town on the river Eden in Cumberland, which ought to be understood. It is certain that even almost all the English historians themselves acknowledge that Malcolm I. obtained Cumberland a little before Indulphus began to reign ; viz. in the year 946.

With regard to Lothian the English writers are divided in opinion. Simeon Dunelmensis § says, “ that Eadulf Cudel, earl of Northumberland, an indolent and timorous man, fearing  
 “ left the Scots would revenge upon him the  
 “ loss of their countrymen whom his brother  
 “ had killed, resigned to them all Lothian, for  
 “ the sake of procuring their friendship.” But the Scots stood little in need of his bounty : for

§ Hist. Uchtredi, col. 81.



Simeon || himself relates, “ that almost the whole  
 “ people from the river Tees to the Tweed  
 “ perished, as they fought against the innu-  
 “ merable multitude of the Scots at Carram;”  
 which happened in the time of Edulf, in the  
 year 1018. The same is remarked by other histo-  
 rians \*. It is evident, from the words of Simeon,  
 that the limits of the county of Northumberland  
 were comprehended between the Tees and  
 Tweed: of consequence then, his Lothian must  
 have lain betwixt these boundaries.

John Wallingford, or whoever was author of  
 the work which Gale published under his name,  
 writes, “ that Kenneth king of Scots represented  
 “ to Edgar king of the English, that Lothian  
 “ properly belonged to his jurisdiction, being  
 “ hereditarily possessed by the kings of Scotland;  
 “ and obtained it on paying him homage for it.  
 “ Thus, says he, the old dispute concerning  
 “ Lothian was determined; and still a new one  
 “ is often threatened to commence †.” Which  
 words certainly allude to the great contest raised  
 about the counties of Northumberland, Cum-  
 berland, and Westmorland, in the time of

|| Hist. eccl. Dunelm, c. 30.      \* Vide Fordun. lib. iv. 43.

† P. 545.



Alexander II. king of Scotland †: for, in the age of that writer, there was no controversy between the kings of England and Scotland, concerning any other possessions. By Lothian, therefore, he means these counties; though elsewhere he seems to understand a different country by that appellation ‡: but he is plainly inconsistent with himself in his account of the situation of places: for he sometimes extends the county of Northumberland as far as Edinburgh, and yet would seem to consider Lothian as without these bounds. A more considerable authority is that of Richard Hagustald, an inhabitant of Northumberland, who testifies that the river Tweed was always reckoned the boundary both of Northumberland and the two kingdoms.

I apprehend that the words § which are so confidently quoted from Matthæus Florilegus, ought to be understood in the same sense. “ Edgar, says he, gave to Kinedus king of the  
“ Scots a hundred ounces of the purest gold, &c.

† Vide Reymeri Fœd. i. 374. 400. ‡ P. 541. 543. 545.

§ Usher, p. 350. Carte, vol. I. 330. and vol. II. p. 214.



“ Moreover he gave to the same king the whole  
 “ country called Lothian, upon the condition  
 “ that every year on their festivals, when the  
 “ king and his successors should wear their  
 “ crowns, the king of Scotland should come  
 “ to court, and celebrate the holiday chearfully  
 “ along with the other princes of the kingdom.  
 “ The king besides gave him several houses on  
 “ the road, to accommodate him and his successors  
 “ in going to and returning from the festivals;  
 “ which remained in the possession of the kings  
 “ of Scotland till the time of King Henry II. \*”.

It is certain, that this Henry II. contrary to his  
 oath to David king of the Scots †, divests Mal-  
 colm, David’s grandson, of Northumberland,  
 Cumberland, and Westmorland; and it seems  
 to be these counties that Matthæus means by  
 Lothian. In regard to the hundred ounces of  
 gold, some light is thrown upon that transaction  
 by the treaty between Malcolm III. king of Scot-  
 land, and William II. of England, in the year  
 1091. “ Earl Robert concluded a peace betwixt  
 “ the kings, upon condition that Malcolm should

\* Sub A. D. 975.  
 Neubrig. 1. 22 and 11. 4.

† Hoveden, ad an. 1149. Gul.



“ obey William, as he obeyed his father, and  
 “ that William should restore to Malcolm the  
 “ twelve villas which he held in England under  
 “ his father, and give twelve marks of gold  
 “ annually†.” Twelve marks are equivalent  
 to ninety-six ounces ; and it appears, from this  
 passage, that they still continued to be paid under  
 the reigns of William I. and II. together with  
 the lands in England.

But they contend, that Lothian was then re-  
 garded as part of England. For, in the Wa-  
 verleian annals, it is said, that, in the year 1072,  
 William I. led an army into Scotland, by the way  
 of Scothwade ; and others relate, that, when he  
 entered Scotland, he was met by Malcolm at a  
 place called Abernith.

In the Saxon chronicle, the place by which  
 William entered, is called Gewæde, which word  
 the Latin interpreter takes to signify Tweed.  
 Of which Guthrie says, “ that he cannot un-  
 “ derstand how Gewæde should be the Tweed.  
 “ But the Scots endeavour in vain to deny, that  
 “ the Forth was the antient boundary of Scot-  
 “ land and England: for Scothwæde, which

† Sim. Dunelm. col. 216. Hoveden. p. 462.



“ was the same with the Frith of Forth, other-  
 “ wise called Scotewater, is said to have been  
 “ on their borders; but Abernithy is situate on  
 “ the South of the river Tay.”

The Anglo-Saxon word *Gevæde*, or *Wæde* (if we may interpose our opinion) signifies a Ford, and is the same with *Scothwæde*, *Scottifwath*, or *Sulwath*, a Ford at the extremity of the Solway Frith, near Carlisle, by which the Scots used to invade England, as we learn from *For-dun*, lib. ii. 2. and iii. 7. The authority of Camden, in his chapter on Cumbria, is also to be adduced; he has fallen into an error, however, in saying, that the Roman wall in Cumberland was called by that name, when it was not the wall itself, but the ford in the neighbourhood of the wall, which was so denominated, as appears from the very name. It is known, that the Frith of Forth had the name of the Scottish sea; and in the charter of Malcolm IV. it is called *Scotewater*, but not *Scottifwade*, for it scarcely has any fords.

Abernithy, as the name itself plainly indicates, is a place at the mouth of the river Nith, not far from the ford, where at this day the town of



Dumfries is situate. There are other towns in Scotland of the same name; one near the river Tay, and another on the banks of the Spey, neither of which the king of England ever saw; for they were far from the boundary of the kingdoms, where the place was, in which the kings met, situate near Scottiswath, or the Solway Frith. Scotland, therefore, had the same boundaries then as now. Had historians sufficiently considered these circumstances they would not have thrown out so many absurdities concerning the limits of England and Scotland.

It is indisputably certain, that Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmorland, are frequently spoken of by historians under the names of Lothian, the province of Loid, and county of Loudon. David king of Scotland, on the death of his son Henry Earl of Northumberland, “ immediately led forth Malcolm the eldest son of  
 “ that prince, as yet a boy, and appointing Earl  
 “ Duncan his tutor, ordered the young prince  
 “ to be conducted through all the provinces of  
 “ Scotland, and proclaimed heir of the kingdom.  
 “ But the king himself, with the younger son  
 “ William, came to Newcastle, and receiving



“hostages from the nobles of Northumberland,  
 “brought them all in subjection to the youth,”  
 as we are informed by John Prior of Hag§.

In the chronicle of Normannia||, the same transaction is spoken of in these words: “Mel-  
 “chorm, the eldest of them, got the kingdom  
 “of Scotland, and his Brother William the  
 “county of Lothian.” In the chronicle of  
 Nich. Trivet, “the grandfather appointed Mal-  
 “colm the eldest of the children, to be his suc-  
 “cessor, and made the other Earl of Northum-  
 “berland.” These facts are also related by  
 others†.

But while history records how Henry II. of  
 England, in direct violation of his oath, depri-  
 ved Malcolm IV. then a youth, of these pro-  
 vinces, in 1157, in spite of all the remonstran-  
 ces of his brother William; Will. Neubrigiensis,  
 Thomas Wikes, Walter Hemmingford, Jo.  
 Brompton, and Nic. Trivet, either mention the  
 provinces by their names of Northumberland,  
 Cumberland, and Westmorland, or write that  
 Henry resumed from Malcolm the towns and

§ Col. 280.

|| P. 988.

† Gul. Neubrig. 1. 23.



principal forts in them, as Newcastle, Carlisle, and Bamburgh, with the adjacent territory. But Matthew of Paris, Rad. de Diceto, the Waverleian annals, and Matthæus Florilegus, when speaking of these transactions, mention the towns by the same names with the former writers, but they call the provinces themselves by the denomination of the county of Lothian. It is evident, therefore, that the county of Lothian is placed by them farther south than the Lothians in Scotland. For neither did Malcolm resign that part of the country, nor did Henry demand it.

So likewise in the Saxon chronicle of the year 1091, Lothene is said to be in England; which the interpreter, nevertheless, understands of the Lothians in Scotland, though, from another passage of the same chronicle, it appears, that they were different countries; for, according to that chronicle, Lothene has for a bishop a person named John; but there never was any bishop in the Scotch Lothians before the time of king Charles I. Nicolaus, in an epistle to Eadmar of St. Andrews, written in the year 1120, calls that John the Cumbrian bishop; viz. the bishop



of Cumberland in England, and not of the fictitious Cumbrian kingdom, which never existed, or is said to have existed, except in one or two fabulous lives of Saints. Neither is any such thing to be found in the more antient lives of the Saints, nor in all those authors which are adduced by Usher and Innes to ascertain the reality of such a kingdom. They affirm it from these words in the life of St. Ninian: “ St. Ni-  
 “ nian was born in Britain, of the blood royal,  
 “ in the western part of the island, as is ima-  
 “ gined, where the sea, as if stretching out its  
 “ arm, and making two angles, divides the  
 “ kingdoms of Scotland and England; which,  
 “ that it had a king of its own to the latest pe-  
 “ riod of the English (viz. the Saxons) is proved  
 “ not only by authentic history, but tradition.”

The matter stands thus. We read in the Saxon and other chronicles, that in the year 945, Edmund of England granted Cumberland to Malcolm king of Scots, upon condition that he would assist him in all his wars, both by sea and land: but the Scots appear to have held it before the time of Edmund. In the year 938 mention is made by the English of Eugenius\* king of

\* Wil. Malmesbur. p. 50.



the people of Cumberland, as may be seen in Fordun, lib. iv. c. 21. Malcolm the son of king Duffus†, in 973, is called Malcolm Canmor, son of the king of Cumbrians, whom the English fabulously pretend was made king by Siward Earl of Northumberland, on the extinction of Macbeth in 1054. On which account John of Fordun inveighs very justly against them; though he himself, misguided by their assertion, seems to have erred a little, in relating that this Siward, who is said to have died before that time‡, was in company with Malcolm.

Beside these above-mentioned, another Eugenius the bald, king of the Cumbrians, is called by Simon Dun, § king of the Lutinenses, viz. of the Lothians; for, among the English writers, that name is wonderfully varied. It appears hence, that Elred abbot of Rievalis (for he writes the life of Ninian) has related nothing but truth concerning the kings of Cumberland. Elred died in the year 1166, when William was king of the Scots; in whose time the arm of the sea, which is said to divide the kingdoms of England

† Fordun iv. 36.      ‡ Sim. Dunelm. c. 187. vid. chron.  
Mailros. ad an 1054, 5 and 6.      § Col. 177.



and Scotland, could certainly be no other than the Solway frith.

William of Malmesbury removes all doubts concerning the situation of Cumberland, which Malcolm obtained. After relating, in hist. ii. 7. that the province, which is called Cumberland, was, in the days of king Edmund, granted to Malcolm king of the Scots, under the sanction of an oath, he says, in the prologue of the third book, while speaking of the lands and inhabitants between York and the Solway frith, “ That  
“ the country is called Cumberland, and the  
“ inhabitants Cumbrians.” But they who seek for Cumberland beyond Cumberland do not attend to these facts.

It is universally acknowledged, that, in 1091, Malcolm III. king of Scotland, and William II. king of England, met on the borders of their kingdoms in Lothene, or the Loudon province: but the authors of the Waverleian annals, and Saxon chronicle, say expressly, that the Lothene there mentioned was not in Scotland, but England. Ordericus Vitalis plainly intimates, that the place of congress was on the south bank of the river Ituna or Eden, near the Solway frith,



not far from the spot where William I. met with the same Malcolm twenty years before. “ He assembled, says he, the whole army of England, and led them to the great river called *Scottewatta*; but, the passage being impracticable, he stopped at the Bank.”

It ought to be observed, that, in the printed copies of Ordericus’s history, we read *Scottè watra*, instead of *Scottewatta*, or *Scottiswath*. The editor had mistaken the first part of the word for an adverb, and read the last part wrong, perhaps because we give a river the name of *water*; but that ought rather to have been imputed to the English than the Scotch way of speaking. Nor is such an error to be wondered at in a stranger, when even Camden, by the contrary mistake, has made it *Scotterwade*, where, according to the derivation of the word, it ought to be read *Scotterwatre*. Britan. cap. ‘*Scotiæ divisio*, p. 682. See Innes’s *tentamen criticum*, p. 770.

William II. “ was desirous that Malcolm would bind himself to do him homage at the English court, and, in conformity to the opinion of the English nobles; but Malcolm refused to do it any where else than upon the borders of



“ their dominions, where the kings of Scotland  
 “ had been wont to do homage to the kings of  
 “ England, and according to the opinion of the  
 “ nobles of both kingdoms ||.” Whence it is  
 further confirmed that in the year 1072, the  
 two kings met not at Abernethy on the river  
 Tay, which was far from the borders, but at the  
 mouth of the river Nith, near the Solway frith.  
 It is certain, therefore, that the boundaries of  
 both kingdoms were in that place then as well  
 as now.

|| Simon. Dunelm. col. 218. Hoveden, p. 462, &c.



## C H A P. XIII.

*Of the town of Alcluith, and the kingdom of Stratcludwal, otherwise called Stratclud, or Areclut.*

**B**E D E \* informs us, that the town, or rather the fort of Alcluith, was situate in the extremity of Antoninus's wall, and was to be seen even in his time. "There," says he, "is the town of the Britons, called Alcluith, which, at this day, is a place of great strength." Camden, Usher, and Innes, together with the writers who follow them, interpret these words as if Bede had said, that the Britons still possessed that town in his time. But that a few weak and unwarlike Britons should, for several centuries, maintain the possession of one rock, in the midst of an enemy, is so far from being true, that it is even void of all probability. Nor does such an interpretation seem at all to correspond with what Bede says in another place. I am inclined to think, that he calls it a town of the Britons, because it was fortified by that

\* Hist. Eccl. i. 12.



people in the time of Antoninus Pius; not that they retained it for so many ages, but only that the town was still extant in his time, and continued to be a place of great strength; which it is even at this day, and is called Dunbrettan, i. e. the fort or city of the Britons, though it commonly gets the name of Dunbarton. But if any person thinks otherwise, he may enjoy his own opinion.

Roger of Hoveden, and Simeon of Durham, write, that on the first of August, 756, Edbert, king of the Northumbrians, and Oengus, king of the Picts, marched an army to the town of Alcluith, from whom the Britons received terms. That town has also been rendered very famous by the birth of saints. Usher proves, in a long and serious disquisition, that Patrick, the apostle of the Irish, was born in Ailclud\*: and the author of the Life of Gildas writes, that he was born in Areclut, in a most fertile country, and was the son of Caunus who reigned there. That Kentigern also was born in that town, in the reign of Morken, who was succeeded by

---

\* P. 427.



Roderic, who reigned in the Rock Cloithe in the days of S. Columba, we learn from Adamnan's life of that personage. Nay, Thomas Carte testifies, that, before all these, Constantine the great emperor of the Romans was born in that place.

But John Brompton and Ranulph Higden inform us, that this so much celebrated town was entirely destroyed by the Daci in the year 896. "In this year," say they, "the town of Alclud, so famous for many ages, which is situate on the western extremity of the celebrated wall, was entirely ruined by the Daci." If this were really so, it could not be denied that the Britons inhabited the land between the friths of Clyde and Ituna, or Sulvath. But I shall develope a very curious fable.

The writers, after Bede, observing, that he mentioned Alcluith, situate on the extremity of the Roman wall, and near the frith of the sea, as a town of the Britons, they sought for it among the Britons on the west termination of Severus's wall, near the Solway frith: and, when they could not find any other more applicable,



they concluded, that he meant Lugubalia, or Carlisle. This, therefore, they called Alcluith: on the destruction of which by the Daci, the English entirely lost all knowledge of Alcluith. This happened very opportunely for those who wrote the lives of Saints. For when there was scarce any information to be collected, either of their country or parents, and some of them never had existed, they made choice of a place which was then unknown, viz. Alcluith, as the more convenient for the birth of their saints. And they metamorphosed that rock (for it is no more than a rock) into a country, where they raised up a kingdom, and created kings; from whom they, no less unlearnedly than impudently, pretended that their saints were descended.

Usher greedily laid hold of these circumstances; and not knowing, that, by the town of Alcluith, they understood Carlisle, he became, if not the original inventor, at least the great amplifier of this fictitious kingdom in Scotland. After him Thomas Innes pursued the same tract; but William Guthrie, and particularly Thomas Carte, deliver so minute an account, both of it and its inhabitants, that you would imagine they had been



natives of the place: for there is not an antient kingdom in Britain which they have mentioned more frequently, or with greater confidence.

What I have said is confirmed by Ranulph Higden: “Alcluid,” says he, “formerly a  
 “noted town, is now almost utterly unknown  
 “to the English: for, in the time of the Bri-  
 “tons, Picts, and English, till the arrival of the  
 “Daci, it was a celebrated city. At length,  
 “about the year 870, when the Danes wasted  
 “Northumberland, it also was destroyed. But in  
 “what part of Britain it stood is a subject  
 “much controverted among authors. Bede  
 “says, in lib. i. c. 12. that it was situate on the  
 “western bay of that arm of the sea which for-  
 “merly separated the Picts from the British,  
 “where the famous wall of Severus terminated;  
 “and it would seem, by his account, not to have  
 “been far distant from Lugubalia, or Carlisle,  
 “because that town likewise is placed at the same  
 “extremity of the wall. Others are of opinion,  
 “that the town of Alcluid was the same with  
 “what is now called Aldeburgh, which signifies  
 “an old town, and stands near the river Ouse,  
 “not far from Borrowbridge, which lies about



“ 15 miles west of York. And this appears to  
 “ be confirmed by the words of Gaufrid, con-  
 “ cerning the atchievements of the British, who  
 “ writes, that, when Elidur king of the British,  
 “ was passing a few days at Alcluid for the diver-  
 “ sion of hunting, he found his brother Archgallo  
 “ wandering in the neighbouring forest of Cal-  
 “ trees. But, it is certain, that the forest of  
 “ Caltrees approaches almost to York, and thence  
 “ extends westward near to Aldeburgh, about  
 “ twenty miles in length ; a great part of which  
 “ forest is now cut down, and the ground culti-  
 “ vated. Others again are of opinion, that Al-  
 “ cluid was the town which is now called Burg-  
 “ ham, situate in the north borders of West-  
 “ morland, near Cumberland, on the river  
 “ Eden ; of which, at this day, the vestiges  
 “ excite admiration. The prudent reader will  
 “ judge hence, what opinion is to be formed con-  
 “ cerning Alcluid.”

It was not Alcluith, therefore, at the frith of  
 of Clyde, but Carlisle at the Solway frith, which  
 was surrendered to Edbert and Oengus, the  
 kings of the Northumbrians and Picts, and was  
 entirely destroyed by the Daci about 113 years



after : for that rock was never entirely destroyed : but, that Carlisle was demolished about that time, we have the authority of Simeon of Durham, Radulph de Diceto, John Brompton, Walter Hemmingford, Florentius of Wigan, Matthew of Paris, and others, where they speak of its being rebuilt by William II. in the year 1092. “The king,” says Simeon, “going into Northumberland, rebuilt the town, called in Latin Lugubalia, and in English Carlisle, and erected a fort in it. For that city, like some others in these parts, being demolished by the Danes about two hundred years before, remained desolate till that time.” And that, during the whole of the year 869, in which that town was destroyed, the Danes continued about York, and the river Tyne in Northumberland, where they wasted the country round, is related by Æthelwerd, Simeon of Durham, Hoveden, and likewise in the Saxon Chronicle.

But, it may be said, that Adamnan knew perfectly well where Alcluith was situate ; therefore, that he, at least, is not to be supposed guilty of any mistake : which I readily acknowledge. But not a word is to be found in him concerning



the kings of the Rock Cloithe: that addition is the work of an interpolator, and is remarked as such in that very edition of Bolland, where the life of S. Columba, which at first had been ill received, is still more grossly corrupted. In the edition of Canisius, and others which I have consulted, not a syllable is to be found of these kings.

Jocelin, indeed, who wrote in the end of the twelfth century, had learned in what place the Alcluith of Bede was situate; but this knowledge proved of greater detriment than advantage to his inquiries: for hence it happened, that he applied to Dunbrettan every thing which the preceding writers had connected with Carlisle and Cumberland.

Alcluith, the capital of the Cambrian kingdom, being thus transported into Cumberland, and fixed at Carlisle, it was natural that the kingdom should be removed with it: nor was that very difficult to accomplish. In the former chapter, the names of some of the kings of Cumberland are mentioned, and its situation is described.



In the English historians of the middle age, there occurs pretty frequent mention of the kingdom and kings of the Strathcludwalls, or Strathcludes. That name, as even Camden † affirms, and the older writers also bear testimony, was borrowed from the river Cluyd in Wales. But the more modern authors absurdly, and in direct opposition to all authentic history, derive it from the river Clyde, imagining that Alcluith, the capital of it, stood there; which opinion I have already refuted. For, after Usher ‡, Innes, Guthrie, and particularly Thomas Carte, confound this kingdom with that of their Cumbrian; but the more antient writers, who knew better, make them two distinct kingdoms, though contiguous ||. And because Matthew of Westminster calls the inhabitants *Gatwalenses*, which the others call *Stratclutenses*, or *Stratcludwalli*, he fixes their residence in the visionary kingdom of Cumbria, which I have exploded; and the same Thomas pronounces them, without hesitation, to be inhabitants of Galloway. Afterwards, that

† In Denbighshire, p. 547.

‡ P. 348. 375.

|| Sim. Dunelm. et Hoveden, ad an. 899. Flor. Wig. ad an. 901.



his arguments may appear the more convincing, he substitutes Gallovidia, or Galloway, for ancient Cumberland, without any other authority than because Gallovidia and Galwallia have the first syllable in common. Let us listen to himself: “ Historians universally agree, that Edmund laid waste all Galloway. The concomitant circumstances, the particular mention of the plundering of Galloway, and the severe treatment of Dunmailus, shew, that by Cumbria is not meant the county of Cumberland, but the Cumbrian kingdom, which comprehended the whole diocese of Glasgow †. The Scots are mistaken in thinking that the lands, granted by Edmund to Malcolm, were those which are now called Cumberland; whereas the true Cumbria, or the Stratclud kingdom of the Britons, was situate within the boundaries of Scotland.” He had better suppressed these words; for so far are all historians from concurring in the truth of them, or expressly naming Galloway, that, except by Thomas himself, I have not found the name of Galloway

† Vol. ii. p. 213.



mentioned by any writer who treats of this subject. Wherefore, unless he should produce his authorities, his arguments are all to no purpose, and the controversy must fall to the ground.

Thomas Innes endeavours to support his assertion, of the Cumbrian or Strathclyde kingdom, from a preface written by a clerk of the church of Glasgow, a despicable performance, as every one who reads it must acknowledge; where we are presented with a poor passage to this purpose, from Jocelin's life of Kentigern, dedicated to Jocelin bishop of Glasgow, which we do not think worthy of a refutation, although a learned man among us has deigned to comment upon it.

Thomas Innes, and W. Guthrie, who has extracted his materials from him, deviate a little from other writers in their opinion of this kingdom. They imagine, that the Picts possessed it formerly, and resided there, under the name of Picts, even in the twelfth century; and that this was not the only kingdom of the Picts, for that there was another in Murray. The attempt to prove the existence of the first from Richard Prior of Hexham, who affirms, that the Picts, commonly called *Galveiensis*, constituted a part



of the army of king David I. at what he calls the battle of *The Standard*. They carefully inform us that the Prior saw them with his own eyes, and therefore could not be deceived: as if the people of Galloway, forsooth, in the twelfth century, had retained the custom of the antient Picts in painting their bodies. They appear to credit this fact, upon the mere supposition that Richard could certainly know, by his sight, whether they were Scots or Picts. But if the vague testimony of one or two English writers be reckoned sufficient to ascertain this opinion, pray let the Picts have not only Galloway, but Lothian too; because, about the end of that same century, or rather the beginning of the thirteenth, Alexander Nechamus says,

Anglos a Pictis sejungit limite certo

Flumen, quod Tuedam pristina lingua vocat.

It has been shewn, in chapter tenth, that the people of Galloway were Scots; for they used the same language and party-coloured garments with the antient inhabitants of that kingdom. In Lothian, and the other places on the German



Ocean, the Saxon tongue began to come into use. From which difference of language and habit, it may be imagined, that Richard concluded them to be Picts. But what I think a more probable reason is, that the bishopric, which was instituted in Galloway not long before, had got the name of *Candida Casa*, White-house. But the church of Ninias, who was the first that preached the Christian religion to the Picts, had borne the same name; which led Richard into a mistake: See page 146, et Ranulphi Cantuariensis A. epistolam ad Calixtum Papam, inter x. scriptores Troydenis col. 1746. We have no tradition of any nation existing in Scotland at that time under the name of Picts. Nor is this surprising, when we behold Henry of Huntingdon, a writer of the same century, speaking thus of his own times: “The Picts seem now  
 “to be destroyed, and their language so much  
 “obliterated, that what we are told of them by  
 “antient writers, may appear as fabulous †,” &c.

† Hist. lib. i. p. m. 299.



## C H A P. XIV.

*Of the testimonies of the English limits, and the introduction of the Saxon language in Scotland.*

THOSE, who deny that the Tweed and Solway frith were the boundaries of England and Scotland, might easily be refuted by the testimony of the English themselves; not taken from the vague or ambiguous accounts of historians, but the charters of the kings, bishops, nobles, and soldiers, who have either fought for these boundaries, or negotiated concerning them. Of which, however, a few may suffice. It has been shewn, in chapter xi. that the territory of the Picts reached to these limits, and that Kenneth king of Scotland reduced the whole of it to his subjection. For Kenneth of Alpin is said to have invaded Pictavia, burnt Dunbar and Melrose (towns in the land of the Picts), six times to have vanquished Saxony, and usurped the whole land from the Scotch sea to the river Tweed; which the Scots certainly retained till the time of the Normans. And that the Tweed continued to



be the boundary, both under the kings and governors of Northumberland, I have proved from Richard of Hexham †. Simeon of Durham, and Hoveden agree in the same fact: they relate, that “ Siward, after he had killed Earl Eadulf, “ governed the whole province of the Northum-  
“ brians, from the Humber to the Tweed.”

But we must not be misled by other historians. For Hector Boethius relates, that all the land between the Tweed and Forth was lost in the reign of Donald, the brother of Kenneth; that luxurious prince having, in the space of two years only, corrupted almost the whole nation with intemperance. Osbreth and Ellas, kings of England, taking advantage of this opportunity, raised war against him, but were repulsed in the first engagement. But attacking Donald again, at break of day, when he was rioting in debauchery, they took him prisoner, and slaying twenty thousand of his troops, obliged him to resign these territories. He relates, that Donald, being afterwards thrown into prison by the Scotch nobles, laid violent hands upon himself.

† Inter x. Scriptores, col. 289.



But that this whole story of Boethius is a mere invention, is evinced not only from the silence of the historians above spoken of, but from the evidence of chronology. For, according to him, Donald died in the year 860. Ellas, after the expulsion of Osbreth, obtained the kingdom of the Northumbrians in 867. But, the Danes invading the country that very year, the Northumbrians go to Osbreth, and a reconciliation being effected, he, together with Ellas, joining their forces, march against the Danes, and are both slain. Fordun writes, that this Donald was greatly lamented by the Scots, and all the historians before Boethius are unanimous in his praise. But to return to our subject;

From what has been above related of *Abernith* and *Scottiswath* it is clear, that after the Anglo-Saxons were conquered by the Normans, in 1066, there was no alteration made in the boundaries of Scotland and England during the reigns of William I. and II. Hoveden writes, that William I. coming from the mouth of the river Nith, in 1072, was returned from Scotland.

Alduin and Turgot, attempting to seize the monastery of Melrose, were prevented by Mal-



colm III. king of Scotland, to whom the place pertained, because they would not take an oath of fidelity \*.

In the same year, 1072, king Malcolm bestowed Dunbar in the Lothians, with some lands adjacent, on Cospatrick earl of Northumberland, who had fled from England †.

Ranulph, bishop of Durham, built a castle upon a steep rock in the river Tweed, on the boundaries of the English and Scots, in order to restrain the incursions of the latter; which, upon being demolished by the Scotch army, was rebuilt by Hugh, his successor, in 1154 ‡.

Henry II. king of England, contrary to his oath, as has been observed above, divested young Malcolm IV. of the north parts of England, viz. Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmorland, but he claimed no right to any of the territory beyond them.

William, the brother and successor of Malcolm, being taken prisoner as he was attempting to recover these provinces by force of arms,

\* Sim. Dunelm. col. 45.

† Ibid. col. 205.

‡ Ibid. col. 62.



was constrained by the same Henry to acknowledge the superiority of the king of England, and resign to him the castles of Roxburgh, Berwick, Jedburgh, Stirling, and Edinburgh; which, however, were not looked on as being within the bounds of England, but only as the principal fortifications of Scotland, as we are informed by William of Newburgh\*, who says expressly, that the river Tweed divided the kingdoms of England and Scotland immediately before this surrender†.

The two former of these castles were retained by Henry during his life; but he seems to have restored the rest in the year 1185, when William espoused Ermengard‡, daughter of the earl of Bellomonte, a relation of Henry, as, in the preceding year, he had rendered to him the earldom of Huntingdon. For the other two castles William offered him four thousand merks. Henry

\* Lib. ii. cap. 38.

† Ibid. cap. 30.

‡ N. Trivet. Jo. de Fordun, lib. viii. 48. Brompton, col. 975. Hoveden. Benedict. Petroburg. Thomas Carte ill understood this writer, when he imagines that he says Ermengard had a dowry given her by Henry, vol. i. p. 716. But few English writers interpret their more antient historians rightly.



answered, he would restore them, provided that William would grant him a tenth part of Scotland. William replied, that he would do it, if he could obtain the consent of the Scots. But William, accompanied by the nobility of Scotland, met the bishop of Durham, and other English ambassadors who were sent to treat of and collect the tythes, between Bridgham and Werk (two villages, the one on the right, and the other on the left of the Tweed) and would not permit them to enter his kingdom. For the Scots affirmed, that they never would pay the tenth part, though both their own sovereign and the king of England should swear to it. William, therefore, engaged to pay five thousand merks in lieu of the tithe, but Henry refused \*.

It appears, however, that even in the time of this Henry, William possessed lands in Tindale on the south of Severus's wall. That Robert Bruce certainly bestowed the church of Haut-wysil in Tindale on the monks of Aberbrothoc, as being situate within the kingdom of Scotland, we have, among others, the testimony of Hugh bishop of St. Andrews, who obtained that see

\* Benedict. Petroburg. Hoveden, sub anno 1188.



in the year 1178, and died ten years after; which donation was confirmed by William †. It is manifest, from a copy of letters seen by Dalrymple and Anderson, that John Baliol obtained the earldom of Huntingdon and Tindale, as heir of Alexander III. Which letters, it is to be wished, had been presented to the world before others of inferior value. In the year 1469, Tindale began to be considered as a part of Northumberland ‡.

Upon the death of Henry, William king of the Scots, as became a great and good man, redeemed from Richard the king of England, with money, the liberty of his crown and kingdom, however unjustly it had been violated in his captivity, together with the castles of Berwick and Roxburgh; and, in 1189, he obtained a charter renouncing all these jurisdictions, wherein Richard plainly acknowledges, that his good father had extorted them from William in his captivity. Five years after, when William demanded the restitution of Northumberland, and the other

† Chartul. Abberbroth. ‡ Act. Parl. xi. Henry VII: cap. 9.



provinces, Richard returned for answer, that he ought not to have demanded them at that juncture, particularly when he was at variance with the kings of France ; who, should he agree to restore them, would conclude that he had been induced to that concession more from fear than inclination. By another charter, however, he restored to William all the privileges and tributes which his predecessors had enjoyed ; and regulated the ceremony with which he and his heirs, when they came to the court of the kings of England, should be conducted from the borders of Scotland by the governors of the English provinces. But Hoveden \*, who was then alive, expressly says, that the Tweed was the boundary of both kingdoms ; and that there, the archbishop of York met William king of Scotland to conduct him honourably to the English court : and Benedict of Peterborough †, a writer of that time, says, that the king was supplied with all necessaries on the road by the English, in the same way as his predecessors.

There was no alteration of the boundaries in the time of king John of England. In the first

\* P. 662.

† Ad an. 1189.



year of his reign, the bridge of Berwick being broken down, when Patrick earl of Dunbar, governor of the town, by the command of his master king William, was preparing to rebuild it, Philip bishop of Durham, from the other side of the river, peevishly opposed their founding the bridge on his territories, till afterwards, by a convention, he granted the privilege.

Nothing is more clear than that the limits of Scotland and England remained the same, under the government of the Normans at least, as they were in the time of Henry III. His father John, when straitened by his subjects, laid his kingdom under the jurisdiction of the Pope; who, favouring his party on that account, issued a sentence of excommunication against the king and all the inhabitants of Scotland: and when Henry III. the son of John, had also sworn fidelity to the Pope, his holiness was ever afterwards more averse to the interest of the Scots. Alexander II. king of Scotland, prosecuting his right, while England was rent with factions, reduced to his subjection Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmorland; or rather the inha-



bitants willingly submitted themselves to him. Henry, in the first year of his reign, complained to the pope of the canons of Carlisle, that, adhering to the king of Scots, who was excommunicated, and regardless of the authority of the pope and his legate, they had the assurance to celebrate divine worship in places which were prohibited; and had submitted themselves to the same king of Scotland (when seizing Carlisle in a hostile manner) and sworn fidelity to him as their rightful lord and master; electing also at his instance a prohibited person into the bishopric\*. “For, whereas,” says he, “the church  
“of Carlisle is situate IN THE CONFINES OF THE  
“KINGDOM OF SCOTLAND, it would greatly contribute to the tranquillity of us and our kingdom, that such a head and members were there  
“appointed, as, by their power and influence,  
“might not only benefit our kingdom, but oppose the machinations of our enemies.” The pope assented to Henry’s petition, subjoining this reason†, that “The church of Carlisle, as it was  
“situated on the borders of Scotland, could be of

\* Rymer Fœd. vol. i. p. 218.

† Ibid. p. 220.



“ great service to the king and kingdom of England, if devoted to their interest; and of equal prejudice, if not.” I remark this the rather to shew, that the English implored the aid of the Roman pontiff against the Scots, before the Scots had recourse to him against the English.

In the year 1249 laws were enacted concerning the boundaries, called *Leges Marchiarum*, by twelve Scotch foldiers, and as many English; by which it appears, beyond all doubt, that the channels of the rivers Tweed and Esk were regarded as the limits\* by the very people who lived near them, and mutually fought in their defence. What do the later English writers say to this? Nothing, but a repetition of the same song, that Lothian and Galloway were under the English jurisdiction, and always constituted a part of that kingdom, though the Scots possessed them.

While Edward king of England, the son of Henry, was fraudulently labouring, right or wrong, to reduce the kingdom of Scotland to his subjection, Pope Boniface VIII. by letters,

\* *Leges Marchiarum*, edit. Nicholsoni, p. 8.



sent to Robert archbishop of Canterbury, commanded the king to desist, till he should lay his claim before the papal tribunal. Robert wrote back to the pope \*, that he had set off, for the king was then in the farther parts of the kingdom ; “ But that before he had arrived at the  
 “ town of Carlisle, which is in the marches of  
 “ Scotland, the king with his army had entered  
 “ the part of Scotland called Galwedia.”

In the year 1482, while Alexander duke of Albany, who was in league with the king of England, rebelled against his brother James II. the English took the town of Berwick, which, the affairs of Scotland being in confusion, they afterwards retained. But it is plain, from all their public acts, even to this day, that they still reckon that town to be without the limits of England, by expressly mentioning the kingdom of England, the principality of Wales, and the town of Berwick upon Tweed.

But if the Scots and Picts always had possession of Galloway and Lothian, how happened it that the Saxon language obtained in these coun-

\* Wilkinſii Concilia Britan. i. 261.



tries, and through all the eastern side of the kingdom? This question was imagined to be of very easy solution by a writer I have formerly mentioned \*, while he would persuade us that the Saxons occupied these lands, even before the time of the Romans, because mention is made by some author, of the Saxon shore along the Britains; alledging that shore to be no other than the eastern shore of Britain, to which, according to him, the Saxon inhabitants had given that name. But John Selden †, long since, entertained another opinion; contending, that by the Saxon shore along the Britains, is meant the transmarine shore opposite the south and west part of Britain; and accusing those of ignorance, both of history and the manner of the times, who would suppose the Saxon limit, or shore, to be within the island, either during the flourishing state of the Roman government in Britain, or while it still subsisted in some degree: denying, likewise, that there is any testimony of the Saxons ever touching the British coasts at that time, or infesting any thing that was British,

\* Chap. ix.

† Mare Clausum, lib. ii. c. 7.



except the sea. But it must be acknowledged, that Selden, from too great a desire of shutting up the sea, has embraced some opinions not entirely consonant to truth. For the evidence \*, above adduced from the history of the Romans, proves, that he was mistaken, in alleging that the Saxons had never as yet sailed to Britain for the sake of plunder. More observations to this purpose may be found in John Isaac Pontanus's Historical Discussions. But, what makes most for our argument, it is certain, that the older and more rational writers agree that the Saxons never settled in Britain before the middle of the fifth century, when the Roman government was broken. Ortellius, therefore, Cluverius, and others of whom Selden disapproves, were right in their opinion, that either shore, as well the one on this side the sea as that beyond it, received its name from the Saxons who frequently pirated in that sea, and was called Saxon. It is evident from the account of the Roman empire, that the ports and towns of Kent, or in its neighbourhood, Dover, Reculver, Lymne (or rather Sandwich) are



described as on the Saxon shore along Britain; and in these places the count of the Saxon shores had his lieutenants and soldiers quartered \*. That the opposite shore of France was also called Saxon, is no less evident from the same description of the empire; and that the officers under the dukes of Bretagne and Flanders resided in Gramont, Blavet, Ostend, Alost, Roan, Mardyke, and other towns along the coast of Britany and the Netherlands; of which towns, it is expressly said, that some were on the Saxon coast. The limits, likewise, of this coast are described: for, *the coast of the limits of Bretagne and Cambray extend through five provinces, the first and second of Aquitaine, Senonia, and the second and third Lionnois*. Whoever carefully peruses the 34. 38. 52. 61. and. 62 sections of that book †, will find that the Saxon shore was stretched along France in the same extent, viz. from the mouth of the Rhine to that of the Garrone, as John Isaac Pontanus rightly observes ‡. We must therefore grant, that the name of Saxon was given to that coast by the Saxons who infested it; and not, as has been

\* Cap. 52.

† Notitia Imperii Romani.

‡ Dissert. Histor. c. vi.



ridiculously imagined, that the Saxons occupied that whole coast of France, and thence communicated their own appellation to the shore. The same argument holds good with regard to the Saxon shore along Britain: nor is there any reason to discredit the faith of history for the sake of a mere conjecture. But, if any person obstinately insists, that the Saxons, at that time, absconded in the eastern parts of Britain, for God's sake let us grant them also the whole coast of France.

The introduction, therefore, of the Saxon tongue among us, is to be derived from a later source, and through a different channel. It had begun to be used, in some measure, in the parts of Scotland on this side the Forth, during the twenty years that the Northumbrians held possession of that country, viz. from the year 665 to 685 \*. But it was not till after 382 years that it arrived at any establishment. Then the Normans had conquered England; and the royal family of the Saxons, with the principal nobility and their attendants, took refuge in Scotland.

\* See chap. xi.



Conveniunt, quibus aut odium crudele tyranni,  
Aut metus acer erat.——

“ The nobles of the kingdom,” says Matthew of Paris †, “ disdaining to bear the insolence of  
“ the invaders, fled partly to Malcolm king of  
“ Scotland, and partly to the woods and forests;  
“ where, leading for a long time a dismal life,  
“ they frequently annoyed the Normans. The  
“ earls Edwin and Morcard, brothers, Mercher  
“ and Weltheof, together with some of the  
“ nobles ‡, bishops, clergymen, and many others,  
“ whom it would be tedious to name, retired  
“ from England, and flying to Malcolm king of  
“ Scots, were honourably received by him.  
“ Then Edgar Etheling, the rightful heir of the  
“ crown of England, seeing the country entirely  
“ in confusion, embarking on board a vessel, with  
“ Agatha his mother, and his sisters Margaret  
“ and Christian, attempted to return to Hun-  
“ gary, the place of his birth ; but, a storm arising,  
“ he was obliged to put into Scotland.

† P. 4.

‡ Matthæus Florilegus read it so long since ; but the subsequent editions seem not so genuine.



“ This accident gave occasion to a treaty of  
 “ marriage between king Malcolm and Marga-  
 “ ret.” And a little after: “ But those who  
 “ escaped from the havoc at York fled to king  
 “ Malcolm in Scotland, who graciously received  
 “ all the English refugees,” &c. Also in the  
 Saxon chronicle, for the year 1067, are these  
 words: “ The same summer, Edgar Clito and  
 “ Marlesuegen, with many others, departed for  
 “ Scotland. King Malcolm received them all,  
 “ and married the sister of Clito.” “ Mal-  
 “ colm,” says William of Malmſbury, “ graci-  
 “ ously received all the English fugitives, and  
 “ gave them what protection he could; especi-  
 “ ally Edgar, whose sister he married, in confi-  
 “ deration of her illustrious descent. On that  
 “ account he infested the bordering provinces  
 “ of England with fire and rapine.” “ Whence,  
 says Simeon of Durham, “ Scotland is stocked  
 “ with English men and maid servants; so that  
 “ to this day there is not a farm-house, or even  
 “ a cottage, where they are not to be found.”

Nor did the English alone, but, after them,  
 many of the Normans find refuge under Mal-  
 colm. For, when William II. upon the exclu-



sion of his elder brother, had seized the kingdom of England, a great party of the Normans, filled with indignation, conspired to drive him from the throne. William, equally diffident of the justice of his cause, and the support of his friends, resolved in this emergency to conciliate the affections of the English; who, partly from their hatred to the Normans, and partly from the ample promises made by William to enact milder laws, and abrogate the excessive taxes, were so much blinded as to espouse his party: and the Norman conspirators, being vanquished and proscribed, retired in great numbers to Scotland. Hence it happens, that, during the reigns of the sons of Malcolm in Scotland, the names and surnames of the English, and especially the Normans, occur so frequently, and in such numbers, in the royal and other charters. Those who were more noble and magnanimous, whether English or Normans, betook themselves to Scotland, while the baser, and the tools of tyranny, ingloriously remained in England.

The most noble and powerful of these strangers Malcolm presented with lands and possessions,



generally near the borders of the kingdom: the habitation of the rest was appointed in the towns on the eastern coast of Scotland, which, from the destruction of the Picts till that time, had been less in number, and were often annoyed with the irruptions of the Danes.

That this was the case appears partly from charters, and partly from the testimony of historians: “There was,” says William of Newburgh†, “a vast number of English in the army of William king of Scots; for the towns and boroughs of Scotland are known to be inhabited by the English. When an opportunity offered, the Scots avowing their innate hatred towards them, which they had dissembled from the fear of offending the king, destroyed all whom they found; those who could escape taking refuge in the royal garrisons.” It is natural therefore to imagine, that the Saxon language would spread from the towns over the country. Nor is it to be questioned, that after the overthrow of the Picts, some of the Danes also settled in these parts; and they used the same language, only with somewhat a different dialect.

† Lib. ii. cap. 34.



But they deny, that ever the Saxon language was spoken pure in Scotland, and without some mixture of the antient Scotch. This, however, they insist upon, without any reasonable authority; nor do they consider, that the language we make use of abounds with Norman words, which is a proof that it did not prevail among us till the English were conquered by the Normans.

It is certain, that the nobler part of the English, who fled from the face of William duke of Normandy, came into Scotland. And that many Normans followed them in the reigns of William and Stephen, appears clearly from their surnames, which occur frequently in the charters, both of the kings and others, at that time, and afterwards; such as Balliol, Bisset, Bruce, Colville, Giffard, Gordon, Hay, Heris, Maule, Melville, Mowbray, Montgomery, Morville, Mortimer, Oliphant, St. Clair, Somerville, Umphraville, and such like; which can scarcely be supposed to have been introduced otherwise than by the Anglo-Normans.



## C H A P. XV.

*Of the homage which was wont to be paid by the Scotch kings to those of the English.*

**T**HAT the kings of Scotland had antiently the sovereignty of Cumberland, a county of England, and afterwards obtained Northumberland and Westmorland, together with the county of Huntingdon, and, if not the whole, at least a part of the County of Northampton, is evident from the historians above-mentioned\*, as well as others, and might be farther confirmed by a multitude of charters, if necessary. By the possession of those territories they were vassals of the kings of England, and paid homage to them, in the same manner as these did to the kings of France for their territories in that country. But the English contend that such homage was always paid for the kingdom of Scotland.

Indeed, that Henry II. extorted homage for Scotland itself from William king of the Scots,

\* See chap. 12, 13, 14.



on his being accidentally taken prisoner, while he was prosecuting his right in England, is true, and has been observed above†. Edward also, the great grandson of Henry, when the affairs of Scotland were in confusion, on account of the contest about the succession to the crown, by fraudulently pretending friendship, procured a repetition of the same acknowledgement. But Richard I. the son of Henry formally renounced to William, by charter, for a sum of money, all the jurisdictions and right of superiority which were claimed; as did likewise Edward III. to Robert Bruce. These two instances, therefore, discover rather the fraud and avarice than justice of the English. For, notwithstanding these charters, and the payment of the money which had been stipulated, they still continued to arrogate the homage of the kings of Scotland, as their right.

Thomas Carte, in his history of England, grants, with great difficulty, that, before the captivity of William, the part of Scotland beyond the Forth was always free from subjection; but he strongly insists, that the country, on the south of the

† Chap. xiv.



Forth, had ever been a fief of the English crown. On which account, according to him, Elizabeth very justly assisted the Scots in their rebellion against Mary, their injured, and never enough to be applauded sovereign: nay, he contends, that had she deprived her of the whole province on this side the Forth, she had done no more than justice †. For he took the whole Cumbrian and Stratclut kingdoms, which were never so much as thought of till after the time of Mary, to be real dominions in Scotland: which, however, are shewn above to be absolute fictions ‖. The English historians, therefore, must devise some other pretext, before they can either applaud or extenuate the injuries and cruelty which were offered to Mary.

But they urge that “ William king of the  
 “ Scots paid homage to king John of England  
 “ in the year 1200, when as yet he possessed no  
 “ land in England: which, if it was not done  
 “ for the whole of Scotland, must certainly have  
 “ been for Galloway or Lothian, or rather both.  
 “ For Hoveden asserts, that John put off the  
 “ determination of William’s claim to Nor-

† Tom. 3. p. 382.

‖ Chap. 12, 13, 14.



“thumberland, Cumberland, and Westmor-  
 “land, till the next Whitfunday.” But, had  
 they understood Hoveden rightly, they would  
 have acknowledged, that he speaks not there  
 of the possessions, but of the right which Wil-  
 liam claimed. “William king of the Scots,  
 “says he, became a vassal of the king of Eng-  
 “land, by virtue of his right.” Concerning  
 that right, and the nature of it, he had spoken  
 before. “William, says he, Prior of May,  
 “Walter Prior of the island of St. Columba, and  
 “William de Hay, who were sent on the part  
 “of William king of Scotland, came to John  
 “king of England; by whom William de-  
 “manded, of John, Northumberland and Cum-  
 “berland, with their appurtenances, IN RIGHT  
 “of his patrimony\*.” And afterwards pro-  
 ceeds: “having therefore done homage, Wil-  
 “liam king of Scotland demanded, of John king  
 “of England his lord, all Northumberland,  
 “Cumberland, and Westmorland, as his right  
 “and heritage; and after a long negociation,  
 “in which they could come to no agreement,  
 “the king of England asked the king of Scot-

\* Hoveden. p. 794 811.



“ land, that he would allow him till Whitsunday  
 “ to consider of it. Which request being granted,  
 “ William king of Scotland departed for his  
 “ own country early next morning, being  
 “ Thursday, November 23d, with the same re-  
 “ tinue which had conducted him to the king  
 “ of England.”

Matthew of Paris, a more antient author, apprehended rightly enough the sense of these words of Hoveden, which later writers have mistaken, though by interpolations used in the transcript, he has rendered them ambiguous. Whence, it is surprising, that, of all others, his authority has not been adduced by our adversaries. “ William king of Scotland, says he, “ did homage to king John FOR ALL HIS POSSESSIONS ;” a most unjustifiable amplification, as being entirely false, unless he means *for all his possessions in England*. William certainly did homage to John, for the same reason that he had done it to his brother Richard ten years before, not for what he possessed, but what he was in justice to possess; “ for *holding* his dignities in “ England, in the same way as his brother “ Malcolm,” says Hoveden †: “ for his right

† P. 662.



“ in England, says Matthew of Paris †.” Therefore, when they speak of William’s right, it is evident, that they understand the above-mentioned counties, which were unjustly detained from him.

From what has been said it will appear how rashly Thomas Carte inveighs against John of Fordun as a falsifier, because, in the copy he exhibits of the writ of renunciation, granted to William by Richard, the lands of king Malmcolm, which are there spoken of, are said to have been in England, when the words *in England* are not to be found in the original writing. But, as it is certain, from the testimony of the English historians themselves, that the lands were really in England, and the very transaction clearly declares it, a candid reader would rather conclude, that these words had originally been placed in the margin by way of explanation, and thence by some transcriber, had afterwards been received into the text ; which most of the learned know to be a practice not uncommon in books. When, therefore, the sense is no ways altered by that interpolation, but is even ascertained

† Ad an. 1189.



more clearly, neither Fordun, nor the librarian, deserve the imputation of falsehood. For though the insertion of such explanations in the text, is not to be approved of, yet those, who admit only what is so much to the purpose, certainly merit less censure than others, who, either from design, negligence, or carelessness, misinterpret the words of authors, and wrest them to a bad sense.

But, with regard to that homage, it is sufficient to have remarked, that, in the tenth century at least, the kings of Scotland possessed lands in England, as has been shewn above. And though king John delayed restoring Northumberland and the other lands to William, he never denied his right to them, but rather acknowledged it by his writs; and, both for the charges of inquiring into the grounds of the restitution, and some other conventions of less moment, he received from William ten thousand pounds of silver. Afterwards, in the year 1237, the pope of Rome interposing his authority, an agreement was made between their sons Henry and Alexander, in the presence of the Cardinal of St. Nicholas in the Tullian prison,



that the king of Scotland should receive many lands in these counties. By virtue of this treaty, the lands of Tindale, Seureby, and Penrith, were adjudged by the English parliament, in 1293, to John Balliol, as heir of Alexander III. as appears from the acts published by William Ryley.

The English, not content with disputing by arguments drawn from history, have fabricated various charters under the names of the kings of Scotland, in order to shew the subjection of that kingdom to England. But Anderson, in his collection of observations, has clearly proved these charters to be fictitious, though he appears sometimes not fully to have understood the historians. After him T. Ruddiman entered the lists; and they both have exposed the forgery by such undeniable evidence and arguments, that it is unnecessary to insist on the subject any further. To them, therefore, I shall refer the readers who are curious of the inquiry; as I am not disposed to repeat what is already ascertained, nor does the brevity of this essay permit it.



## C H A P, XVI.

*Of the introduction of the Christian religion into Scotland.*

**E**cclesiastical writers furnish a strong argument for the antiquity of Scotland, when they say that the Scots in Britain were instructed in the Christian religion in the second century after the nativity of Christ. Tertullian, in his book against the Jews, expressly says, that *the places of Britain which were inaccessible to the Romans, were become subject to Christ*: which words cannot be understood of any inhabitants of Britain but the Scots: not of the Britons, for they were conquered by the Romans more than a hundred years before this was written: neither of the Picts, because they did not embrace the Christian faith for about two hundred years after the Time of Tertullian, as appears from Bede's Ecclesiastical History \*.

We find nothing mentioned particularly concerning the state of religion among the Scots for two centuries after Tertullian: only Chry-

\* Lib. iii. c. 4.



sofom informs us, in general, in his book against the Jews and Gentiles, written in the year 376, that the British isles had felt the force of the word : and, long before him, the emperor Constantine the Great writes, that the feast of the passover was celebrated in Britain, not on the same day as among the Jews, but on the same as among the other Christians of the north and west †. St. Athanasius observes, that the decree passed in his favour, by the council of Sardis in 340, had, among others, approved of the bishops of Britain ‡. Hillary, a Pictish bishop, inscribes his book on Synods to the bishops of Britain, among others. Sulpitius Severus relates, that “ three British bishops, who  
 “ were at the council of Ariminum in 359, not  
 “ having of their own wherewith to defray their  
 “ charges, had recourse to the public fund, and  
 “ refused the collection which was offered them  
 “ by the other bishops, as thinking it more reasonable to be a burthen on the public, than  
 “ on private people §.” And it is little to the purpose that no mention is made of the parti-

† Euseb, vita Constantin. c. 19.  
 Arianos, cap. 1,

‡ Apolog. contra

§ Hist. II. 41.



cular provinces of Britain whence these bishops had come : for it is evident, from the writings of these, and other antient ecclesiastics, that the same faith and doctrine, and the same rites and government, prevailed over Britain as in other places of the west. That the Scots and Britons, together with the Picts and Irish, after these became Christians, were entirely unanimous in those points, is so frequently affirmed by Bede, who was perfectly acquainted with their doctrine and practice, that there is not the smallest room for any doubt.

Prosper of Aquitain, in his chronicle on the consulship of Bassus and Antiochus, i. e. A. D. 431, has these words : “ Palladius is ordained  
“ by Pope Cælestinus as the first bishop to the  
“ Scots who believed in Christ.” For it was usual with the Roman pontiffs, when they sent bishops to any nation where the Christian religion flourished, to invest them with authority over the other bishops of the country. Thus Pope Gregory conferred the primacy on Augustin the monk whom he sent into Britain. Cælestinus bestowed the like dignity on Palladius among the Scots, whence he is called, by Prosper, the first bishop of that country.



But as a person may be said to be the first, either in respect of time, or order and dignity, the ambiguity of the word has led Fordun into the mistake of thinking, that “ before the ar- rival of Palladius the Scots had only presby- ters or monks, who administered the sacra- ments, and observed the rites of the primitive church ||.” Before him also, Ranulph Higden an Englishman, or at least the author of the Polychronicum which is quoted by Fordun, had interpreted this passage of Prosper in the same sense, and inverted a little the order of the words, the more to accommodate them to that acceptance. It is probable that they reasoned in this manner: if there was no bishop among the Scots before Palladius, who was not appointed till the year 431, they must have had only presbyters and monks, from the time of Pope Victor, which comprehended a period of more than two hundred years. But had they reflected, that any person, who is superior in dignity, though inferior in point of age, is properly said to be the first, they would have spared both themselves and others a great deal of pains; for

|| Lib. III. 8.

E e



the innovators of later times have often entrenched themselves behind their authority.

That the first successors of Palladius were afterwards bishops among the Scots is not only probable, but confirmed by authentic monuments. Sedulius, a British bishop of Scotch extract, and Fergus, a Pict and bishop of Scotland, subscribed with Pope Gregory II. to the decrees of the Roman council in the year 721. And, lest any should infer, from his being here spoken of as the bishop of Scotland, that there was only one bishop in Scotland, it is to be observed, that, after the overthrow of the Picts, the principal bishop in Scotland had his residence at St. Andrew's, and he and his successors, as far as the fourteenth century, were each denominated by the title of the bishop, sometimes the first bishop, or what is the same, the chief bishop of Scotland, as appears from their charters, seals, and other monuments \*. Nor did any of the other ten or twelve bishops in Scotland ever assume the same title. This was not unknown to Walter Bower, who writes, that "the bishops of St. Andrew's were not the oldest, but the

\* Andersonis diplom. Scotiæ, lam. C.



“ principal in the kingdom †.” The testimony of Nicholas, an Englishman, is still more to the purpose, who, in an epistle to Edmer, elect of St. Andrew’s, in the time of king Alexander I. written in 1120, has these words : “ the church of  
 “ York, therefore, will give over arrogating the  
 “ primacy of Scotland ; which, if it could obtain, as the BISHOP OF ST. ANDREW’S is called  
 “ the HIGHEST PRIEST OF THE SCOTS ; (but the  
 “ HIGHEST is only he who is above others ; and  
 “ he who is above other bishops, what is he but  
 “ archbishop, although the nation, from its  
 “ rudeness, knows not the use of the pallium) ?  
 “ If, I say, the bishop of York should have the  
 “ supremacy over him who is called the HIGHEST  
 “ PRIEST of his nation, he would not only be  
 “ metropolitan, but primate of another kingdom ; an assemblage of dignities which never  
 “ were known to be united †.”

As Fordun has mistaken the sense of Prosper, so has his own been misapprehended by later writers, as if he had said, “ the Scots, following the rite of the primitive church, had

† Vide Fordun. Histor. lib. VI. 24.  
 Anglia sacra, vol. II. p. 234.

‡ Whartoni



“doctors of the faith, and ministers of the sacraments, not bishops, but presbyters or monks, before the arrival of Palladius :” whereas Fordun means that these doctors of the Scots followed the rite of the primitive church, in the observation of Easter, and other ceremonies : for, in the beginning of the seventh century, there was no small contention between the Scots and the disciples of the monk Augustin, the apostle of the English, about the observance of that feast ; of which the origin is to be traced farther back.

Before the council of Nice the church of Rome, as appears, had adopted the Jewish cycle of 84 years for the celebration of the paschal, and accommodated it to the calculations of the Christians ; at least, that a cycle of this kind was in use among the Jews, we learn from Epiphanius §, and that the same still prevailed in the Roman church after the middle of the fifth century, is evident from Victorius of Aquitain’s prologue to his cycle, and from the letters of Ambrose, Paschasius, Cyrillus, Pope Leo, and others, published by Bucher ; though the church

§ Vid. Epiphan. Hæres. 51. Alog.



of Rome never celebrated that cycle in the same manner with the Jews, and often departed from the form which it had originally instituted.

For at first, among the Romans, in the construction of their cycle of 84 years, the vernal æquinox was fixed to the twenty-fifth of March, which is near about the æquinox of Julius Cæsar: and they never celebrated the Paschal feast before that period, unless they were obliged to it by the shortness of the paschal month, of which the day above-mentioned was always the most early commencement, and the latest of its termination was the twenty-third of April, between which limits, the cycle marked the paschal Sundays from the fourteenth to the twentieth moon. Such was the original state of this cycle in the western church, which, that it obtained in the Latin church before the council of Nice, may be gathered from the paschal register of a hundred years, which first Bucher||, afterwards Echard, published\*: for there, in the years 316 and 320, the day of the paschal

|| De doctrina temporum, p. 252.  
medii ævii, tom. I. p. 14.

\* Inter scriptor.



will be found to be regulated by the fourteenth moon.

After the council of Nice this cycle underwent a great alteration in the church of Rome. They carried back the vernal æquinox, which had been observed too late, from the twenty-fifth to the twenty-second of March, from which day to the twenty-first of April, they extend the paschal month; nor did they celebrate the paschal Sunday from the fourteenth to the twentieth moon, as formerly, but from the sixteenth to the twenty-second, so that the cycle was rendered very different. Then, some time after Palladius was sent among the Scots, Prosper of Aquitain again somewhat changed the cycle, by fixing the regular period of the motion to fourteen years, which had formerly been computed at twelve: and under this form the church of Rome used the cycle of 84 years, till the year 457, when Victor of Aquitain, in the papacy of Leo, made the cycle to consist of 532 years; which, however, did not obtain long, for the decennial cycle of the Alexandrians was adopted by almost the whole western church, so that in the space of about 150 years, the remembrance



of the antient cycle seems to have been intirely obliterated, unless among the Scots and Britons, to whom the knowledge of the change of the cycle either had not reached, or was not adopted by them. For they always used the cycle in the way it was regulated before the council of Nice: whence they were called schismatics and assertors of the fourteen years, by Augustin the monk and his disciples, though, in regard to the observation of the paschal feast, the Scots really differed as much from the practice of the fourteen years men, as Augustin himself. And this furnishes a strong argument that the Scots embraced the Christian religion very early.

In this and other ceremonies, Fordun is of opinion that the doctors of the Scots observed the rites of the primitive church; which indeed in a larger sense is true: but that there were no bishops in the primitive church, he never so much as imagined. In the present and last age, notions of this kind seem to have entered into the minds of some people, while they endeavoured to give the sanction of antiquity to opinions which scarce ever had been heard of before. But though these innovators could im-



pose upon their dim-sighted followers, they must be despised by every rational person ; for whoever is the least acquainted with ecclesiastical history knows, that, among the antient Christians, the office of a bishop was reckoned indispensable in every church.

Nor is there any reason to imagine that the ecclesiastical government among the Scots differed from that which was universally received in other churches, though all the monuments of it had been lost ; whereof, however, not a few, and these too of unquestionable authenticity, still remain : which, were they carefully collected and reduced into order, would raise the glory of the antient church of Scotland beyond what was to be expected. Many nations have been taught the Christian religion by the Scots, as the Irish, most part of the English, the people of Britany, and others : many churches, convents, and abbeyes in Germany, France, and Italy itself have been founded by them, while they still adhered firmly to the antient rites which had been rejected by the church of Rome, and trained their disciples in them ; some of whom, with their followers, retained them above an



hundred years after they were abolished by the Scots themselves. A memorable instance of this occurs in A. D. 818, in which year the emperor Ludovic, surnamed the Pious, undertook an expedition against Morman, who had rebelled in Britany, and slew him. In that expedition, while he was encamped on the banks of the river Elegium near the forest of Brisiac, hearing that the rule of St. Benedict was not received into the Landowinoch monastery of St. Winvaloc, he commanded the abbot Marmonocus to follow the holy rule, and that, rejecting the manner of shaving of the Scots, which had till then been retained with the rites of the ancient Britons, they should adopt the Roman manner in conformity to other churches. On this subject Ludovic published an edict; “ intimating TO ALL BISHOPS, and the whole ecclesiastical order in Britany, that, when Marmonocus the abbot of the monastery of *Landowinoch* had come into his presence, and he had interrogated him concerning the conversation and manner of shaving of the monks of these parts, and found that *they still retained*



“ the form of conversation and shaving the head,  
 “ which they had received from the Scots, con-  
 “ trary to the practice of all the holy apostolic  
 “ and Roman church, he had commanded the  
 “ said Marmonocus that they should live accord-  
 “ ing to the rule of St. Benedict, inasmuch as it  
 “ was practicable and praise worthy ; and, in re-  
 “ gard to shaving the head, that they should con-  
 “ form to the holy Roman church : and that the  
 “ monks be careful that the manner of living,  
 “ enjoined in the rule of the holy and excellent  
 “ father Benedict, be observed, not only in the  
 “ afore said monastery, but in other places of  
 “ the same province.”

But some insist, that, till the beginning of the  
 tenth century, the doctors of the Scots were of  
 that kind of religion called *Culdees*, who rejected  
 bishops, of whom the remains were not entirely  
 extirpated in the beginning of the fourteenth  
 century. And indeed, that there was a sect of  
 religious men known by that appellation is cer-  
 tain : but what were they ? nothing more than  
 secular presbyters and monks, professing the  
 same rites and doctrines with the rest of the  
 church, except the form of shaving, and the rule



of observing the paschal before the year 715, of whom the colleges were mostly instituted, and endowed by the bishops themselves. These Culdees possessed the right of electing the bishops, wherever they had a college about the see: and their principals and colleges used to ratify the covenants of their bishops in affairs pertaining to the church, as is known to be done in ecclesiastical chapters. All this is evident, not only from history, but the acts of the Culdees and bishops themselves, still extant, (which would be tedious to insert, and I have exhibited in another place\*) so that it is surprising whence contrary opinions could have been derived.

In regard to the etymology of the name *Keledii*, the supposition of Boethius and Buchanan, that it was taken from the Latin words *cultores Dei*, as much as to say that they were worshippers of God, is not at all probable: for, in the more antient writings, they are always termed Keledei, and not Culdei, as commonly at this day: and this observation makes against Nicholson bishop of Carlisle, who contends, that Cul-

\* Vide Fordun. VI. 43. 44 & Præfat. in episcopor. Scotor. catalogum, per R. Keith episcopum,



deus denotes a black monk, from the colour of his cap (*cucullus* †.) For in the old Scotch language, *cucullus* is interpreted *culla*; but what connexion has this with Keledei? Others think that the title was borrowed from the Greeks, like those of most of the ecclesiastical offices, as *episcopus*, *presbyter*, *diaconus*, *monachus*: for monks who live in cells are called by them *Κελιωται*. But as in all the western churches there is seldom or never any mention made of the Keledei, except among the Britons and Scots, and their disciples the Irish and northern English, it is most probable, that the word is of Scotch original, and those who are learned in the antient tongue of that country affirm that it denotes *a servant of God*, a sense extremely well adapted to the character, and is compounded of the word *Keile*, a servant, and *Dia* God; which is by far the most satisfactory explanation.

† In præfat. ad biblioth. historic. Hiberniæ.



## C H A P. XVII.

*Of the antiquity of the league between the Scots  
and French.*

**T**H E Scotch historians derive an argument, in favour of the antiquity of their country, from the league which the emperor Charles the Great is said to have entered into with Achaius king of Scotland; and they infer, that the Scots must have been, at that time, a very eminent and illustrious nation, when so great an emperor was desirous of their friendship. Though this argument appears to have no great weight, the subject deserves to be investigated. The English writers allege it is incredible that a treaty could have been maintained inviolably between two nations for so many ages; and that there never was any treaty between the Scots and French before the year 1371, in the reign of king Robert II. or, at most, in 1295, in the time of John Baliol. And, concerning that treaty, the the historians both of France and Scotland seem to agree. Eginhard, who is said to have been



secretary to Charles the Great, writes, that “ he  
 “ (Charles) had the kings of Scotland so much  
 “ devoted to him by his munificence, that they  
 “ never called him any thing else than Lord, and  
 “ themselves his subjects and servants. That let-  
 “ ters are extant from them to him, confirming  
 “ this affection for him.” The later kings of  
 Scotland seem likewise to have addressed the  
 kings of France in much the same manner.  
 John Baliol certainly begins in these words:  
*To the most excellent prince, his lord and friend, if*  
*it seemeth good, the illustrious lord Philip king of*  
*France.* Paulus Æmilius, writing of Charles,  
 has these words: “ He bestowed the honours  
 “ and magistracies of the nation upon foreigners,  
 “ especially the Scots, whom he greatly regard-  
 “ ed for their fidelity and valour.” But the  
 newness of that league is proved most of all by  
 a letter of the Scotch nobles to the king of  
 France, in the year 1308, of which, as far as is  
 now legible, the following is a translation.

“ To the most christian and victorious prince  
 and reverend lord, lord Philip, by the grace of  
 God, illustrious king of France, William earl of



Rofs, Malcolm earl of Levenax, William earl of  
 and the communities of the coun-  
 ties of Fife, of Meneteth, of Mar, of Buchan,  
 and of Catenes, the heirs of which are minors;  
 also the communities of the other counties of the  
 whole kingdom of Scotland,

Dunbar, Edward de Druys lord of Galloway,  
 James Steward of Scotland, Alexander of Ergadia,  
 Dovenald de Yle, John of Meneteth, Hugh son  
 and heir of the earl Gilbert de

Haya constable of Scotland, Robert de Keth mar-  
 shal of Scotland, Thomas Ranulph lord of Nyth-  
 dale, James lord of Douglas, Alexander de Lyn-  
 defay, Alexander de William Wyfe-

man, David de Berkeley, Robert Boyd, also the  
 barons of all Ergadia and Ynchgally, and all the  
 inhabitants of the kingdom of Scotland, ac-  
 knowledging the authority of lord Robert, by  
 the grace of God, king of Scotland, and of all

m. Your contract shewn  
 to us in writing, and explained more at large  
 in the full parliament of our lord Robert king  
 of Scotland, lately convened in the town of  
 St. Andrews, impresses our minds with joy and



gratitude

For

we greatly regard the king's attention to the affairs of the Holy Land; to prosecute which, the friends of the Christian faith ought certainly to rouse their diligence, and bend their minds more zealously. We behold contained in your contract what affords the king the most grateful sense of your friendship, and recalls to mind the leagues which have long since been made and confirmed between the kingdoms of France and Scotland, as well as the losses, oppression, and disasters which the inhabitants of Scotland have hitherto suffered from the English. Above all, we are particularly delighted with the singular affection which you are pleased to testify for the person of Robert, by the grace of God, our sovereign lord

made a

prince by truth and right, and the justice and favour of the king of kings. We, therefore, duly attending, as becomes us, to these circumstances

your zeal for the affairs

of the Holy Land

we return thanks

to your royal magnificence for your affection to our lord the king, and your concern for the



liberties and rights of the kingdom of Scotland,  
 praying the divine                    by the mercy of  
 Jesus Christ, to grant success to the zeal,  
 which, by his blessing, you have conceived for  
 accomplishing the foresaid ends

                                         greatness. Let your majesty  
 piously remember, that in the exaltation of  
 Christian princes the name of Christ is magni-  
 fied, and the catholic faith strengthened. If,  
 therefore, the condition of our lord the king,  
 which is intimately connected with that of our-  
 selves, should be raised by the favour of your  
 majesty, and the kingdom of Scotland recover its  
 antient liberty, the tempests of war being sub-  
 sided, lasting peace restored

                                         the object of our desires, toward fulfil-  
 ling the divine will, and aiding your cause, your  
 royal highness may have not only our lord the  
 king aforesaid, but also the inhabitants of his  
 kingdom with all their power. And that

                                         we send this letter to your royal  
 highness, signed with our seals, written and dated  
 at the town of St. Andrews the 16th day of  
 G g



March, in the year of our Lord 1308, and the third of the reign of our lord king Robert.

Affixed are the seals of

William Earl of Ross,  
 Malcolm Earl of Levenax,  
 James Steward of Scotland,  
 John de Meneteth, Dunevald and Nigel  
 Cambel brothers,  
 Gilbert de Hay,  
 Robert de Keth,  
 Hugh de Ross,  
 Thomas Ranulph,  
 William de  
 Alexander Frazer,  
 Thomas Cambel.

It appears, from these letters, that, about four hundred and fifty years ago, not only the Scotch and French historians, but also the kings and people of both nations, acknowledged the leagues subsisting between them, as of remote date, and mentioned their antiquity, at that time, almost in the manner we do now; but it can scarcely



be supposed, that either nation was mistaken in that point, or was desirous of deceiving the other. How, therefore, can the English writers deny these facts? That these treaties were composed of numerous prolix conditions, and a superfluous repetition of words, as is now the custom, I cannot believe; for these began not to be used at that time, nor was there any occasion for them between faithful allies. But that a friendship subsisted betwixt these nations, and that singular privileges were granted to the Scots by the kings of France, before the time of Charles the Great, we are informed by Charles himself, in the following edict:

*Mandate of Charles the Great for restoring to the Church of Honaugia\* such things as had been carried off from it.*

Charles, by the grace of God, king of the Franks, an illustrious person, recommends to all who have received any thing pertaining to the church of the Scots, which is in the island of

\* Hanaugia, it is imagined, was the ancient name of Jersey.



Honaugia, that they immediately restore what they have received or taken away, without the permission of the holy abbot; and if any person shall hold back the smallest article, he recommends to all the judges in his dominions, to make inquisition concerning all the effects belonging to the church, according to the laws of the Franks: because the affairs of strangers pertain to the king. Let every thing, therefore, be restored to the church of the Scots, without fail, whether land, vineyard, money, men, silver, or gold. If any person fulfils not this injunction, let him know that he has disobeyed the king's order. For the kings of France granted protection and privilege to all the Scots, that no person shall spoil them of any of their effects, and no race, but their own, possess their churches. So do, henceforth, as you would preserve our favour.

F I N I S.











**Otto Gilch**  
Buchbinderei - Prägerei  
**München 8**  
str. 42 - Tel. 44 2052







Goodall, Walter

An Introduction to the history and antiquities of Scotland

London 1769

Brit. 309 m

urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10280398-9